The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1919 No. 2816

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, Associate Editors — LINCOLN COLCORD, FREDA KIRCHWEY

DAVID T. POTTINGER, Business Manager
MIRIAM R. WALTER, Circulation Manager

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Four dollars per annum, postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $5.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, NEW YORK. Chicago Office: Room 1348, People's Gas Bldg. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Headley Bros., Pub., Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 969

EDITORIALS:
- Defeat the Treaty! 972
- American Militarism Waning 973
- The End of an Era 973
- Music Versus Drink 974
- Repression or Reconstruction 975

AMERICAN BUDGETARY REFORM. By J. P. Chamberlain 976

A CONFERENCE UNREPENTANT. By William MacDonald 978

CHILD MASSACRE AS A POLITICAL WEAPON. By Norman Angell .. 980

LANIER AS A POET OF NATURE. By Norman Foerster 981

THE PARALLEL OF REVOLUTION. By Lincoln Colcord 983

SUMMER RAIN. By Marie Emilie Gilchrist 985

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 985

CORRESPONDENCE 986

LITERATURE:
- The Larger Altruism 988
- The Future of the College 988
- "America First" 989
- Fellow Mortals 990
- Snapshots of British Notables 990

BOOKS IN BRIEF 991

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 993

THE first week of the annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor in Atlantic City would seem to have demonstrated once more the backwardness of American organized labor and the inadequacy of American labor leadership as exemplified by the so-called "Gompers machine." This backwardness and inadequacy, obvious enough and disastrous enough in the piping times of peace, stand out with startling clearness against the world's present social unrest, and are well-nigh fatal to the chances of an intelligent American movement toward reconstruction. With labor in England and on the Continent demanding participation in the management and control of industry, the progressive abandonment of the wage system, and the institution of an entirely new social order; with half of Europe in the grip of communism, and the other half agitating the elements of social philosophy, acutely aware of what it is discussing and where the argument leads—with such an object lesson before its eyes, the American Federation of Labor, in convention assembled, and dominated still by the old blind leadership, supports the peace treaty and the League of Nations, dedicates its efforts to the stamping out of Bolshevism, and wastes its days in a futile discussion of superficial issues. The magnificent speech of Miss Margaret Bondfield, fraternal delegate from England, in which she outlined the ambitions and purposes of British labor toward a new social order, fell upon the convention like a message from another planet. Mr. Gompers, from the platform, has already branded the whole Pacific Coast delegation as Bolsheviki. "The autocrats of American labor are in control," comments a wise observer. "They have the power of the Gompers machine behind them, and they are going to use it ruthlessly. If the convention finishes as it has begun, there is likely not to be any American Federation of Labor a year from now. Its powerful machine-control is wholly out of touch with the times; and the more vital impulses of the rank and file are plainly in evidence. If they are not absorbed by the leadership, they will disintegrate the organization."

THE headquarters of the Russian Soviet Commercial Bureau in New York were raided early last week and all its papers and movable property confiscated. There are some peculiar features about this raid. First, the chairman of the New York State Legislative Investigating Committee has denied responsibility for it. Second, the Attorney-General of New York State, Mr. Newton, has denied responsibility for it. Third, neither the Federal Government nor the City of New York appears to have had anything to do with it, because no Federal agents or city police were employed in carrying it out. The raid was conducted by State constabulary and a band of detectives from a private agency. Fourth, in charge of the raid and exercising specific direction of it, was the superserviceable Mr. Stevenson—Archibald E. Stevenson, of green and fragrant memory as the traducer of Miss Jane Addams and other reputable persons whom he gazetted in the public press as sympathizers with Germany. We know nothing of the activities of Mr. Martens and his associates beyond what may be known to anyone; but we are quite sure that if they are contrary to law or prejudicial to the interest of the United States, the Department of Justice, the State authorities, and the District Attorney, all and several, are competent to deal with them. On the face of it, and from the best evidence available to us at present, the raid looks like an infamous and outrageous burglary; and we earnestly suggest an investigation into the exact tendencies of the mephitic Stevenson, who to the best of our knowledge is a private citizen and amenable to the same laws that govern the rest of us.

NO sooner has all America thrilled to the success of Commander Read in making the first aeroplane crossing of the Atlantic and to Hawker's daring attempt, than the news of the flight of Captain Alcock and Lieutenant Brown comes to amaze the world. A non-stop flight across the Atlantic of 1932 miles in 16 hours and 12 minutes only seventeen years after the discovery of the aeroplane! It seems really incredible, but there is the fact; two mortals have safely fought their way over this extended stretch of ocean, never able to see stars or sun or moon because of fog, or properly to steer their magic craft, storm-tossed and sleet-lashed, part of the time flying upside down, yet as if by divine protection guided to the very point they sought. It is a tale so vivid, so compelling, so dramatic, that the world can scarcely grasp it. How the globe would have rung with

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it had not the feats of Read and Hawker preceded! But the suffering and daring of the pilots show how many difficulties remain to be overcome. Seventeen years hence these problems may all be solved and regular air crossings the vogue. If they are, we trust that the names of Read, Alcock, and Hawker will be honored as the pioneers. We confess to great satisfaction that the two Anglo-Saxon nations share equally the honors of the first crossings.

THE four months' strike of the mill operatives of Lawrence must not fade into the past without a protest at the effort of certain powerful newspapers of the country, notably the *New York Times*, to convince their readers that the strike "collapsed." As a matter of fact, the strikers won all of their demands, including a forty-eight hour week and a fifteen per cent. increase in wages, besides beginning well the organization of a nation-wide textile workers' union. If this is defeat, a few more such will produce radical revolutions in methods and men at Lawrence. Already there are surprising indications there of an attempt at the next constructive step. Thus, a certain superintendent has asked one of the three clerical leaders of the strike to undertake the organizing of a shop committee in his mill—actually turning for help to a man who a few weeks ago was denounced as a pestiferous interloper and an anarchist, and is even now described in the *Times* as an "outside agitator" and a "parlor Bolshevik." It is precisely because there were three such Bolsheviki among the leaders of the Lawrence strike that the story of its human phase is so cheering to those who are faint of heart as they regard the growing tension between capital and labor. Harold Rotzel, Cedric Long, and A. J. Muste are the three New England ministers who gave up their churches because of conscientious objections to war to devote themselves to work in the social field.

FROM the beginning, these three clergymen undertook to lead the strike in the spirit of peace, preaching absolute non-resistance, no picketing, and no violence. The *Times*, admitting that the strike was remarkably free from disorder, attributes this record to the efficiency of the police. The statement is not true. The strike would probably have equalled or surpassed in violence that of 1912 in the same city, but for these pacifist leaders. There were tense moments when an inflammatory word would have brought about an explosion. One of these clergymen was clubbed without word or reason by the police; he took it as a matter of course, and was careful to prevent its being utilized to inflame the workers. One of the foreign-born leaders of the strike was kidnapped and terribly beaten by the representatives of law and order; the three pacifists still talked non-resistance and the patient endurance of wrongs. And this policy of quiet non-resistance maintained the peace of the town in spite of the provocation of the constituted authorities. It is a lesson that needs to be borne in the heart and carried in the mind, particularly by the leaders of labor who have too often injured or ruined their cause by countenancing or inspiring violence on the part of their supporters. Fortunately, every day brings gratifying news of strikes conducted to their conclusion without violence. The bloodshed at the Willys-Overland Works, in Toledo, is fortunately exceptional. From Canada, too, still in the throes of an unparalleled strike producing unparalleled bitterness, comes no news of serious conflicts. It is a record to date to cheer and encourage.

FROM several sources we have received copies of the examination on the great war set for the high schools of New York on June 12. The question exciting chief interest was this:

1. (a) Who are the Russian Bolsheviki and what are their chief aims?

(b) Do you believe the following principles to be in accord with or in opposition to these aims:

1. Rule by the majority.
2. Progress under law.
3. The right of each person to the product of his efforts.
4. Encouragement of individual initiative.

(Give in each case the reason for your belief.)

(c) Do you believe Bolshevism to be a danger threatening the people of New York? If so, why?

(d) Tell definitely the sources of your information about Bolshevism; explain what has led you to believe as you do about this movement.

Each pupil was asked also to give the name of his history teacher, or if he was not taking history, that of his English teacher. Those who are acquainted with the recent progress of New York's schools toward standardized thinking will need no further comment than the remarks of Dr. John L. Tildsley, Chief Thought Controller, as reported in the *Tribune:* "There is no desire to trap any of the teachers. The number of teachers that adhere to un-American doctrines is quite negligible and even if they desired to preach their doctrines to the pupils they would not dare." This is reassuring. Even more so is Dr. Tildsley's comment on the case of a boy in the Morris High School who stated in his paper his belief that the problems confronting America cannot be settled peaceably: "We have a provision in our school rules requiring each pupil to express his or her loyalty to the city, State, and nation before we graduate them. We have no obligation to graduate a student whose attitude is hostile to our American institutions. You will probably hear of this case at the Morris High School." Probably; and probably a refusal to grant a young boy his diploma will increase his respect and affection for American institutions.

THE merry game of debasing our American universities and abasing the professorate by dismissing men whose opinions are not liked continues, unchecked by the fact that peace is at hand. The latest happening of interest occurred at Rice Institute, Houston, Texas, where Professor Lyford P. Edwards has been dismissed out of hand because "while asserting and maintaining great loyalty to his own [England] as well as to this country, he possesses certain views in respect to political conditions in Russia, the character of Lenine, and some of the principles underlying the Soviet government of Russia so at variance with the prevailing sentiment of the people of this and the Allied countries and so contrary to the fundamental principles of our own government as, in the opinion of the trustees, to utterly destroy his further usefulness to the Institute. . . . The trustees have therefore requested his resignation." So it is an academic sin in America to think well of Nicholas Lenine's character, although European statesmen are everywhere freely saying that Lenine is the ablest statesman produced by the war; it is to render yourself unfit to teach in America to believe that there may be something worth while in the Soviet form of government, although a prominent American official at the Hotel Crillon in Paris has informed the assembled American correspondents that if the Soviet form of government were fairly and equitably administered he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saw no reason why it should not be at least as democratic a government as any in the world, if not the most democratic. Alas! Sedition in Rice has gone far beyond Professor Edwards. An anonymous senior gives voice to these deadly sentiments: "The only trouble about the May 11th talk was that Dr. Edwards misjudged his audience. He thought he was talking to a group composed entirely of intelligent persons and it turned out he wasn't. . . . If there is anything that would make me a Bolshevist, it is not Dr. Edwards's lectures, but the hysterical way in which an alleged statement of his has been taken up by the community." We hate to think what this young anarchist would say about the trustees of his disgraced institution.

THE Walsh-Dunne report on conditions in Ireland, now available in its complete text, is as shocking a document as any that has been called forth by the world's present relapse into barbarism. It records a situation of utter horror in Irish prisons, and of almost unbelievable brutality on the part of the British authorities. Hundreds of men and women have been confined for months without charges having been preferred against them; hundreds have been discharged from jail with broken constitutions and shattered minds as a result of their treatment. Prisoners have been confined in narrow cells with their hands handcuffed behind them day and night; in this condition they are fed by jail attendants, and are permitted no opportunity to answer the calls of nature, other than to lie in their filthy clothes. During the winter and spring, prisoners have been showered with ice-cold water, and forced to lie on stone floors in their wet clothing; many of these died of pneumonia. The specific charges of the report are seventeen in number; they are enough to stop the mouths of those who prate of civilization. The report was published in full in the *New York Herald* of June 15. Commenting on its history, the *Herald* says, under a London date line: "The report came here from Paris early this week. Those who saw it were stunned. Publication was withheld by the newspaper owners, who demanded that the Government answer the charges and publish them simultaneously with the report. This official denial was not forthcoming, and finally the report appeared in a London newspaper. It stunned England. At first, English newspapers could find but one word to use in answer to the charges. That word was 'lie.' Still there was no Government denial. The following day another newspaper printed the report. Today it was printed in full by two other London journals."

APPARENTLY it needed only a series of military defeats and an attitude of great reserve towards the conditions laid down by the Allies to determine the Peace Conference to pledge their support to Admiral Kolchak. His internal weakness, his retreat, his refusal to summon the old Constituent Assembly or to hold immediate elections for a new one, his record of violence and absolutism—all these appear only to encourage the Four to trust his rule as the sort of rule they want to see established in Russia. His equivocations doubtless sound frank and convincing to the Peace Conference. He has promised them a safe future democracy, in a country shorn of Bolsheviki and all elements that tend to make the outcome of elections uncertain and the composition of assemblies impure. His reply caught the very tone and flavor of the official pronouncements of the Conference. The words were fair enough; their import was sufficiently obscure. The Four at Paris have kept a few anchors to windward. They have let it be known that their assurances of support of the Omsk dictatorship in no way imply diplomatic recognition. Perhaps this is a sage precaution in view of the present direction taken by the Admiral's "progress," and the parlous state of his internal affairs. Perhaps Mr. Wilson has made mental note of the financial situation of the Omsk Government, and the common report at Paris that the United States will be expected to provide "the largest part of the aid" required to keep Kolchak afloat on his unruly sea of Bolshevism. Perhaps, too, the present dictators of the world have heard enough to realize that to the mass of the working people of France and Italy and Great Britain the words of Admiral Kolchak sound neither frank nor convincing.

FOR weeks the people of the Allied world were fed on stories of the swift success of the armies of Kolchak. On March 13 he captured Ufa from the retreating Bolsheviki. On May 15, he took Samara in heavy-faced type on the front page of our daily papers. Other military victories followed in rapid succession. At almost the same time, Petrograd was reported to be on fire and in a state of explosion, starvation, and evacuation. Then, suddenly, the bubble broke. It was first publicly pricked in a dispatch published by the *New York Globe* from its special correspondent at Petrograd telling that the city was intact, and prepared for its defence to the last man and woman; that the people were hungry, but persisted in tracing their hunger to the Allied blockade rather than to the rule of the Soviets; and that Kolchak and his Allied arms were retreating rapidly on all fronts. Immediately following this news, Winston Churchill, British War Minister, speaking in the House, admitted that "the check to Admiral Kolchak's advance was now more pronounced, and that no attempt should be made to encourage extravagant hopes in that quarter." Samara, it appears, fell only in the headlines of the papers. Ufa was retaken by the Bolsheviki on June 9. The correspondent of the *Globe* stated that the peasants in the region evacuated by Kolchak, although "previously dissatisfied with the Soviet rule, are now flocking to enlist in the Red Army." At the same time, representatives of the remnants of Soviet rule in Siberia warned the Allies that "the population of Siberia" would not acknowledge any guarantees made in their name by the Government of Kolchak, and that they would rise against the interference with their internal struggle of "all foreign detachments of troops on the territory of Siberia." That this is more than a paper manifestation is evidenced by the Associated Press reports of Bolshevist strikes and disorders on the Trans-Siberian Railway, and by Kolchak's own admission that the country is riddled with Bolshevism. A captain in the Intelligence Division of the American Expeditionary Force serving in Siberia states in an amazing article in *Hearst's* magazine for June that "ninety-five per cent. of the people in Siberia are Bolshevik," while "the Trans-Siberian Railway is virtually in the hands of the Bolsheviki." Kolchak's one support is his army, and even in the army, according to the report of a recent arrival from Siberia, writing in the *New York Times*, every soldier is "as much a Bolshevik as the soldier he was fighting against." No wonder the Admiral's progress is swiftly and steadily toward the Pacific—or that the Big Four with their hopeless capacity for betting on the wrong horse in Russia have chosen this hour to uphold him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Defeat the Treaty!

THE revised peace treaty handed to the Germans on Monday constitutes a distinct victory for liberal and radical opinion. On May 10 the Germans were told in these words that it was a case of take it or leave it: "They (the Allies) can admit no discussion of their right to insist upon the terms of the peace treaty *substantially* as drafted." Of the treaty itself a chorus of approval arose from imperialists everywhere. It was the promised peace of justice—"terribly severe but just"—according to the *New York Times*, while the *Evening Post* even went so far in its awed admiration of this commixture of hypocrisy, bad faith, and imperialism, as to speak of its being like a "voice from heaven"—in the justice, we presume, of its rigid sentencing. But to liberals everywhere it sounded only like a voice from another region, condemning the world to another era of imperialism, secret diplomacy, ill-will, and international hatreds, if not to anarchy and chaos. The voices of protest raised everywhere had their effect upon the self-appointed parcellers of the world. The take-it-or-leave-it policy was abandoned and after eighteen days of wrangling, of compromising, of further bargaining in secret, the revised terms of the "perfect treaty" are before us. This time the Germans are told that they can make only a yes or no reply.

The revised terms are correctly described as involving no change in principle—or spirit, we should add. They are accompanied by a most effective and truthful rehearsing of the crimes of the Germans plus the familiar upbraiding of the German people for not revolting sooner. Despite Mr. Wilson's repeated assertions that we were warring, not on the Germans, but on their rulers, the former are again judged guilty, and their judges once more veil their own land-grabbing, their deliberate violation of the Fourteen Points upon the basis of which they concluded the armistice, by regrets that the nature of the case necessitates the judgments imposed. As for the modifications of the terms, they are to be welcomed—notably the plébiscite for Upper Silesia, restoring to respectability in this case the unhappily violated principle of self-determination. For the rest, the Big Four explain that their language did not mean what it said; that the Germans quite misunderstood this point and the other, and that, by the grace of God, they are to be admitted to the League of Nations not now but soon, if the stability of their government warrants it and if they properly carry out a treaty which cannot be carried out. There is no recession from the theft of the Saar Basin; the outcry against the abominable outrage upon the Chinese of Shantung goes unnoticed. Assurances there are that the gracious Allies do not mean economically to cut the throats of the vanquished, but simply to go through their pockets. The Germans may even constitute a reparation commission of their own to be in touch with the Allied body whose members are to be the real rulers of Germany for fifteen years. And this is the final reply; this the final proof to the world of the unselfishness, of the love of justice of the Allies; the final proof that this was a war for liberty and humanity, for the rights of nations, for the freedom of the seas; the final proof that this was a war to make democracy safe and to end war itself. On Monday, Andrew Bonar Law in the House of Commons declared that there were *twenty-three* wars going on in the world—all as a result of the war to end war. Thus have the Allies restored peace and the Council of Four made mock of unselfish aims.

So the deed is done, so far as Paris is concerned. But the anger of the supporters of this wicked pact, who do not see that it does far more injury to the morale of the Allies and their standing at the bar of history than to the Germans, continues unabated. Our metropolitan press is turning upon the liberals who have compelled the modification of the treaty but will still have none of it, and seeks to shoulder upon them the responsibility for the failure of the treaty, if it fails in Washington. The Big Four are guiltless; it is only those who refuse to compromise with their consciences and to remain silent when this glorious opportunity to make over the world is flung away in hypocrisy and greed, who are guilty. Patriotism, we are told, should drive liberals into condoning wrong-doing, into forgetting the nation's pledges, into turning their backs upon the ideals which Mr. Wilson set up for the nation when it entered the war. Liberals will do nothing of the kind. They indignantly repudiate the idea that the responsibility is theirs. Who was it who all through the war championed the President and upheld those ideals? Who were the men and women in England and France and Italy who bowed down and worshipped him when he came to Europe, but the liberals of those countries and the masses of the peoples? Why are these persons, who wanted nothing so much as to uphold him, all against him today? Because they know that he has sold them out and because they will not connive in silence. Their loyalty is a higher one than to Woodrow Wilson and his confederates in Paris; it is, as Mr. Wilson has so often declared, to humanity itself, and, we would add, to sincerity, to truth telling, to honesty, and to common decency as well.

But now Mr. Wilson is speedily to return and go upon the stump at home in order to convince us once more that black is white and white is black. We are doubtless to hear that the Fourteen Points prevail wherever applicable. We are to be told again that the half loaf of the covenant is not what he wanted, but that we must gratefully accept it as the best we can get because it is the basis for the whole treaty. The *Nation*, for one, cannot compromise one iota of its opposition to the treaty. The possibilities of evil in it and in the sham league are so great that it wants both rejected and a simple declaration by Congress that the state of war is at an end. But, the argument runs, do you not see, that you are throwing yourself into the hands of the most reactionary Republicans; you are striking hands with a Nelson and a Lodge? Liberals have no use for the Nelsons and Lodges. It was Maria Weston Chapman who during the Abolition struggle marvelled that the good Lord used instruments in that cause which she would not touch with a forty-foot pole. Sixty feet we always wish between us and Mr. Lodge. But our concern is not with him. If he were upholding the treaty with the *New York Times* we should still be opposing it. We have no present interest in the treaty as a political document; we are interested in it as an index of integrity and good faith. There is only one question for liberals: is the treaty just, in keeping with our national honor; will it achieve peace and righteousness? And just because honest men must answer "*No!*" liberals will continue to oppose the treaty and the League to the limit of their powers, leaving the responsibility where it properly belongs—upon the perpetrators of this crime against the men who died in France for something else.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Militarism Waning

MOST gratifying are the signs that come from various directions of the abating of the militarist mania in America. Particularly is there reason for profound thankfulness in the attitude of the returned soldiers. There is every evidence, despite the lawlessness of many men in uniform on May Day, that our troops have returned from overseas with a stomach-full of soldiering, with no love for the trade and none too much for their officers, with the greatest eagerness to get out of uniform, and with the minds of many open to new ideas. We meet on every hand returned men who insist that no future emergency could get them into uniform again, and we have even heard of a captain who, after having gone to France with the intention of becoming a professional soldier, recently forfeited a two week's leave with pay in order to take his discharge immediately; he would not wait fourteen days to don civilian clothes.

Such incidents as these might well be mere straws, if there were not so many of them. Thus the *San Francisco Call* reports that the sentiment of the Seventy-seventh Division, in which there were many Western men, was largely opposed to universal military service and to parading; they wanted to get through with the whole thing. The *Call* is convinced, as a result of its observations of the returned soldiers, that "we shall not, and cannot have universal military discipline" until America is radically changed. Indeed, so great is the reaction from universal military service that the National Security League is really in despair about it. In a very frank letter to the *New York Tribune* its publicity director reports that in all high school and college debates the proponents of universal military service were "defeated at the ratio of practically two to one." He adds: "The League considers the results in these debates and the comments thereon most illuminating as an exposition of an enormous sentiment against universal military training which will have to be overcome." To the *Tribune* he makes a touching appeal: "We trust that you will keep up the fight," but the stony-hearted editor answers in the headline: "Let the League do it." This deliberate abandonment on the part of the *Tribune* of the one thing indispensable to keep the Hun and all future Huns from our shores, is certainly amazing, but not more so than the complete calm with which the country has received the news that the army estimates have been cut so severely by Congress that in place of an army of 509,000 men asked by the War Department we are to have the beggarly one of 300,000, upon which we are to spend $718,000,000, instead of $1,100,000,000, and that after all we are not going to have the greatest fleet in the world.

It is interesting, too, that the army's recruiting campaign by means of appeals to meetings and groups of citizens has absolutely broken down; it is the gossip in Washington that returned soldiers have interfered. So the army has resorted to a new device—advertising! Some two hundred thousand dollars are to be expended in proving that military service is not a military affair at all—bless your innocent heart, no!—but really a university extension course under most experienced teachers. The first page-advertisements which have appeared in the dailies—needless to say the dailies think very highly of this procedure—inform us that "being a soldier of the United States is the finest business in the world." It is surely obvious that the drafted men do not think so, or else it would not be necessary to advertise now for men to take their places; but perhaps they were not aware of what the advertisement tells us, that the soldier "meets agreeable people *including lots of nice girls*, at Hostess Houses, et cetera [very much et cetera]. He goes to dances, if he wants to. In fact, he usually has a better time than a civilian." Comment is surely superfluous save that Secretary Baker, who has told Congress he approves this girl-bait, has plainly reached the silly stage of his career.

Most gratifying of all is the decision of the American Legion, which refused to be stampeded into endorsing universal service at its St. Louis convention, to do away with all titles. Its members declare they will not make the mistake of the G. A. R.; for them every member, whether he be a young Roosevelt or plain Jim Smith, will have the title of Mr. and nothing else. Satisfactory as all this is, it is not time to declare that all danger is over. The universal training bills are still before Congress and are to be pushed with all possible speed. Efforts are being made, moreover, to inculcate the spirit of militarism among the young boys, despite the fact that the New York State Reconstruction Commission has come out squarely against universal military training in the schools. It has been a military failure in New York as it has been these many years in Massachusetts. Nevertheless, Secretary Baker has yielded to the demand for universal training for high-school and college students, and the lobbies of the army and navy and National Guard are still at work. It behooves all opposed to Prussianism in America to fight vigorously all such proposals.

The End of an Era

THE death of John Coit Spooner marks definitively the end of an era. He may be spoken of henceforth as the last of a great race. During his senatorial career of sixteen years he had as associates such men as Hoar, Sherman, Conkling, Aldrich, Platt of Connecticut, Edmunds, Allison, and Davis; and for perhaps the major part of his term of service—certainly during its latter years—he was the ablest man in the Senate. He was a lawyer and a politician; but within those limitations he took the largest going view of his vocation and kept consistently to the highest going sense of responsibility in his avocation. In learning and wisdom, in common-sense and executive skill, in acuteness and brilliancy, he stood preëminent, and typical of the very best that the old order of political leadership could offer.

And now we are reminded that this order has forever disappeared. His death gives the *laudator temporis acti*, the superficial observer, the politically-minded, and the heritors of aristocratic distrust of popular government, a good chance to indulge despondent forebodings. When shall the Senate see his like again; whither shall the political aspirations of the country look to find such leadership as his? Certainly, by no stretch of the imagination can one see such a figure in the present Congress—or indeed, anywhere on the political horizon. The parties are shockingly put to it to discover even as many as two or three the country over who will stand a chance of acceptance as "presidential timber." But more than this, we are all aware that a figure like Spooner or Sumner, or even Blaine, would be an anomaly in the Senate today; he would be a man out of place and not at all the kind to meet the demand. The material out of which political leadership is made is doubtless here—first-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rate ability did not perish out of the land with the giants of old time. But it is no longer really wanted for that purpose, because political leadership itself seems gone. Political leadership was a tradition, an attenuated survival, of the days of kingship and chieftainship, a carrying-over from the time when the masses of men acquiesced in the idea that they neither had undergone the discipline nor possessed the information necessary for intelligent self-determination in politics. Possibly they have not yet gotten this discipline and information; but no matter, the important thing is that they think they have: and to the extent of their increasing confidence in themselves, multitudes have lost use for political leadership and become quite careless of it.

This is less true here, naturally, than in that Old World which is so rapidly becoming the New World; but here too it is a well-marked tendency, and an event like the death of Mr. Spooner gives occasion to note how far it has progressed. Observers who are able to look below the surface of things come back from Europe and tell us that the really significant phenomenon there is the widespread distrust of parliamentary institutions and, *a fortiori*, of political leadership. The movement towards democracy, they say, is a mass-movement; and they insist that the only leadership possible is that which might figuratively be attributed to the man at the apex of a flying-wedge. The masses, they declare, will listen to prophets, accept educators, employ agents; but they will have no leaders. Who can have failed to remark how the great demonstrations of the laboring people in England, Russia, Canada, Hungary, and even here, have been carried on in singular and striking independence of a leadership that was intrinsically political? Leader after leader, in fact, was swept aside, and only those survived who were quick to take in their new position as mere agents; quick to catch and interpret the will of the masses, and loyal in its prosecution.

All this is extremely novel and disquieting to the large number of Americans who are bred in the traditions of leadership, who demand a leader, and do not see how anything short of chaos is possible if one is not forthcoming. The Americans who witnessed the extraordinary order and the definite purpose of mass-movement at the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, asked who the leaders were; and being told there were none, found it incomprehensible. They saw the Lvoffs, Miliukovs, Kerenskys, put forth, not as leaders, but as agents, tried, found wanting, and swiftly displaced—and could not understand it. The great essential movement of the world, in short, is away from any form of delegated government (which is what political leadership implies and depends on) and toward representative and responsible government; and this we are unprepared to see and still more unprepared to trust.

And yet, candidly, if one does not trust it, if one has not abiding faith in *all* the people, as Golden Rule Jones used to say, where can one have any faith at all? The old hitching-posts are gone; those that are not rotted down have been crushed to matchwood by the steam-roller of what some, be they visionaries or be they seers, believe to be democratic progress. If there is no room for a rooting of robust, comprehending faith in *all* the people, then there is no room for it anywhere; faith has perished from the earth. But such a faith is possible, and those who exercise it freely and fully find themselves justified. The two men who out of all our history of officeholding would seem to have a place in the present order of the world—Jefferson and Lincoln—had this faith, and it was their fundamental qualification for life beyond their time. To the eye of this faith, then, the passage of political leadership is neither unnatural nor shocking. Men like Senator Spooner served their day, served it well, and their praise is in their own generation. It is the men who made, one may say, a kind of specialty of this sublime and difficult faith, it is the prophets, philosophers, educators—the Jeffersons, Phillipses, Lincolns, Thoreaus, Whitmans—who overlive their own day with unabated usefulness into the present; and their praise is for ever and ever.

Music Versus Drink

MUCH has been said about the effect of prohibition in increasing the vogue of the "movies"; but why should not high-class entertainments, like concerts, benefit by this change as well as the picture shows? Men, with very few exceptions, have never become acclimated in concert halls. Most of them are like the distinguished novelist who, when asked what he thought of music, replied "Oh! I see no harm in it." It is an anomalous situation that while most musicians, at least at orchestral concerts, are men, the listeners are almost all women. It is no exaggeration to say that if it were not for the women in this country, musical entertainments, with the exception of musical comedies and possibly opera, would be impossible. Even such favorites as Paderewski, Kreisler, Novaes and Grainger would play to arrays of empty benches if they had to rely on men only as hearers. Nor, except in the largest cities, would most musicians be able to secure engagements if it were not for the women's clubs. Of these, there are about six hundred that come under the head of musical clubs, with a membership of 200,000. Without their assistance in bringing singers and players before the public, managers would often be in despair.

It is true that men's clubs also engage musicians now and then to entertain them, but not to the same extent as women's clubs. Now why are women—at least in this country—so much more addicted to the tonal art than men? Is it because it gives them what the men have found, or sought, in alcoholic drink? When the famous singer Malibran heard Beethoven's Fifth Symphony the first time, she was so overcome with emotion that she had to be carried out of the hall. The emotionalism of some women at concerts of favorite singers, violinists, and pianists borders on hysteria. Some men are affected the same way. Berlioz was literally intoxicated by music. "While hearing certain pieces," he wrote, "my vital forces seem at first to be doubled; I feel a delicious pleasure in which reason has no part. . . . My arteries pulsate violently; tears, which usually announce the end of the paroxysm, often indicate only a progressive stage which is to become much more intense. In this case there follow spasmodic conditions of the muscles, trembling in all the limbs, a total numbness in the feet and hands, partial paralysis of the optic and auditory nerves. I can no longer see; I can hardly hear; vertigo . . . almost swooning." Plainly, the advantage of this sort of musical intoxication over alcoholic is that it has no bad after-effects. On the contrary, it leaves one refreshed and rejunevated. Plato compared its effect on the soul to that of a bath on the body. Margaret Fuller wrote in her journal that by music she "felt raised above all care, all pain, all fear." Is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE BEREA, OHIO

not that the chief vaunted benefit from drink? What need of alcohol is there for the despondent when Martin Luther could write (as thousands of others might have written): "My heart, which is full to overflowing, has often been solaced and refreshed by music when sick and weary."

Giving the devil his due, one must admit that some good results have come from the great war, and not the least of them is the awakening of thousands of our men to the magic of music, and a full realization of its power to solace and refresh the sick and weary. Cases are recorded of men who asked for music before food and drink and treatment of their wounds. At first, our men were known as "the silent army," but soon they learned the importance and the joy and stimulus of singing together. These experiences of two millions and more of our men in camp will not soon be forgotten. They have learned emphatically that music is for manly men as well as for womanly women; that it is not effeminate to yield ourselves wholly to its emotional appeal. For this reason, as we began by saying, music in America ought to have a unique opportunity next season. By judicious management and allurement men might be taught to attend concerts as freely as women.

Repression or Reconstruction

THE Manufacturers' Council of New Jersey is, from the standpoint of logic, a diverting organization. In a recent notable address, printed in full in last week's issue of the *Nation*, Basil M. Manly, joint chairman of the War Labor Board, called attention to the present widespread and threatening labor unrest, indicated some of its causes, forecast serious industrial and social disturbances unless those causes be removed, indicated the proved inadequacy of the Congress to do away with them, and finally suggested a national industrial conference, after the British model, as the best means of bringing about a peaceful and reasonable adjustment. How do the New Jersey manufacturers accept Mr. Manly's friendly warning and helpful counsel? Through their spokesman they declare the address "a piece of socialistic propaganda pure and simple, except that part which is pure Bolshevism"; they denounce it as "a direct incitement to disorder," raise the question whether we are "being prepared for a Soviet government," and finally wind up by cabling to the President a unanimous demand for Mr. Manly's instant dismissal.

On the same day with this New Jersey pronouncement, the country was favored with the draft of Senator King's "anti-Red" bill, the fruit of the sublimated wisdom of the Overman Committee. We do not at this moment propose to comment on the viciousness of this egregious measure, of which the *New York World*, under the pointed caption, "Why Crazy Laws for Crazy Men?" speaks as follows:

> In the severity of its provisions the new Sedition Bill introduced by Senator King goes far beyond anything ever before dreamed of as necessary for the protection of the Government. . . . It appears to be based not merely on facts that may have been discovered but on fears that may have been excited in the minds of the Senators in the course of their rambling investigation. . . . For national safety it is not necessary to magnify into crimes all the reckless words, spoken and written, of irresponsible agitators hunting notoriety. . . . It groups persons who use scurrilous or abusive language about the form of government with those who advocate assassination of public officials and destruction of public property, and prescribes the same penalties. Even if such laws were to be enacted, they could not be enforced in the courts where reason and justice still prevail.

For the present, we are concerned only with the spirit behind the bill, which is essentially that of the New Jersey manufacturers. The idea boils down to this: the way to insure social peace is to suppress every expression of discontent. In the particular case, let us deport alien malcontents, having fined and jailed them first, and let us fine and imprison American-born disturbers. This, in one form or other, has been the method of tyrants from the day when Pharaoh bade Israel make bricks without straw. From that day to this, every Israel has sooner or later marched out of bondage, while Pharaoh and his hosts have been overthrown in the Red Sea. Yet tyrants learn no wisdom.

On the day following Senator King's announcement, Miss Margaret Bondfield read before the American Federation of Labor the following sentences from the labor memorandum presented to the British Industrial Conference:

> These root causes [of labor unrest] are two-fold: first, the breakdown of the existing capitalistic system of industrial organization, in the sense that the mass of the working class is now firmly convinced that production for private profit is not an equitable basis on which to build, and that a vast extension of public ownership and democratic control of industry is necessary; [and, second, the fact that] the workers can see no indication that either the Government or the employers have realized the necessity for any fundamental changes or that they are prepared even to make a beginning of industrial reorganization on more democratic principles.

Shorn of its socialistic implications, this statement, we are confident, expresses the half-formed conviction of the mass of American workers, whether workers with head or hand. They are not envious of their wealthy and privileged neighbors; they are not greedy; they abhor violence, and they do not even want a revolutionary overturn of the social order to which they are accustomed and whose improvement they desire. But they have grown inexpressibly weary of systematic profiteering and exaction, organized under legal forms, weary of business and finance so arranged as to insure profits for the privileged few at the expense of the working many, weary of the utilization of the governmental scheme primarily to maintain such privilege. All this they have quietly determined to change. That spirit of change is not to be exorcised by deposing a hundred Manlys or by jailing a hundred thousand "agitators." It is to be banished only by doing justice. For all the complexities of detail, the essentials of economic justice are simple, and during recent years the views of workers the world over regarding those essentials have been in process of rapid clarification. First, the worker believes, with the psalmist, that "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof"; and his heart burns within him against any arrangement which makes possible its selfish monopolization. Second, he believes in "democratic control of industry," and he is rapidly securing it, whether by moderate devices like coöperation and shop committees or, failing these, by violent and destructive revolution. Deny these two essentials of justice in man's economic relations, and you insure unrest and strife; assure them, and you create a basis for social peace, on which international peace must be built. It is the part of wise men to turn, before it is too late, from the paths of repression, which have always issued on the precipice of violent revolution, and to walk in the ways of reconstruction in accordance with the laws of justice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Budgetary Reform

By J. P. CHAMBERLAIN

EVERY student of the question recognizes the need for a budget system in our national Government. Both political parties have gone on record as favoring a budget, many political leaders have declared themselves in favor of it, and none, so far, have ventured openly to oppose it. Business organizations everywhere raise their voices against the costly inefficiency involved in the present system of providing for the financial needs of the Government, and since the income taxes have begun to press very hard on individuals and business institutions, the cry for economy is becoming louder. It is, however, quite one thing to want a budget system, and quite another to determine the ways and means by which the system shall be put into effect, and exactly what the system shall do.

Both the executive and the legislative branch of the Government are concerned in a budget law. The executive understands its own needs; it alone has the information upon which the estimates for expenditures can be intelligently based; it knows the result of the existing tax laws, and so can best estimate the probable effects of a change. The preparation of the estimates of revenues and expenditures, which is the capital point of the budget, must, therefore, be a duty of the executive branch of the Government. The legislative branch, however, votes the appropriations; the budget must be presented to the Legislature in such shape that it can use the information presented to the best advantage in preparing and acting upon the appropriation bills which must be introduced.

Our present system, while it cannot be defended, should be understood by reformers, and it must be remembered that Congress must have from the Executive to formulate the revenue and appropriation bills of each year, information in a shape which it can use. In the United States, the estimates for the expenditure are made up in each division and bureau and forwarded to the secretary of the Department, who, after consultation with the bureau chiefs, decides which bureaus should have increases and how much, what changes in the financial status of the bureaus in the Department should be made, so that the interests of the Department as a whole, and not of any single bureau, may predominate in the departmental estimates. An independent establishment, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, makes up its own estimates and sends them to the Secretary of the Treasury. In each Department and independent establishment notes are prepared showing the reasons for increases, and other information which the Department chiefs think Congress should have. The estimates are made up and forwarded on or before October 15 of each year to the Secretary of the Treasury, who binds them together and forwards them to Congress on its assembling in December. The President, the responsible head of the Administration, is not responsible for the estimates, so there is no attempt at coördination of the needs of the various Departments in the interest of the governmental organization as a whole, corresponding to the work of each secretary in regard to his Department; and no attempt by any responsible officer of the Government to bring the estimates for expenditure within the estimated revenue of the Government, in other words, to prevent the outgo from exceeding the income. The Secretary of the Treasury separately sends to Congress a report on the revenue, comparing the estimates for the current year, and a statement of the actual income of the Government during the last fiscal year. Congress, however, must have the estimates presented to it in such form that it can use them, and so it requires them to come in a form similar to that of the appropriation act for the last preceding year, so that when the estimates come in they can be divided and sent to the different committees which are to draft the appropriation bills on which Congress is to vote. Thus each committee receives a statement which can be compared with the estimates and the actual appropriations of preceding years, so that it will know what increases are asked under specific heads of expenditure. Each committee then proceeds to consider each head of expenditure. It calls the officers who are asking increases in their appropriations before it and questions them closely, with the result that increases are very frequently cut, especially increases in personnel; but bureau chiefs, knowing this in advance, customarily ask for much more than they actually need, hoping that the anticipated reduction by the committee will still leave them with the increase they really deem necessary.

Each appropriations committee introduces its bill separately, and the bills proceed through both Houses of Congress without ever being brought under the jurisdiction of one committee for coördination, either among themselves or with the revenue bill which is prepared and introduced by the revenue committees and which provides the money needed to meet the appropriations. Of course, the revenue committees are informed as to the probable total of the expenditure; but they have no right to protest against extravagant expenditure, because of the difficulty of raising new revenue.

Evidently changes should be made in this system, both in the administrative and in the legislative handling of the accounts of the nation. There should be in the Administration the power to bring together all estimates, and to compare them with revenues, and it should assume before the country the responsibility for the totals of the expenditure and the revenue, which means the responsibility for any new taxes which must be laid to meet new outlays. The responsibility for the expenses of the Government, however, should not be put upon the Administration without a suitable force to enable it to carry the load effectively. Any budget bill must provide the Administration with a sufficient force of experts to investigate the reasons for increases in estimates and to investigate the use of money in the past, so that its responsibility is based on independent knowledge. Needless to say, this force, acting from year to year to secure economy where possible, will be the greatest engine for improvement in methods of administration which could be devised, as the object of the Administration will always be to make its estimates as low as possible if it must assume responsibility for them before Congress and before the country.

In our system of government there is but one officer upon whom this responsibility can be put, and that officer is the President. He is the head of the Administration and in him is vested the decision in respect to its policy. He also is more and more generally recognized as the chief of his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party, so that a financial policy decided upon by him will be the result of consultation with party leaders in Congress as well as earnest consideration with Cabinet officers, both in their capacity as heads of the great Departments representing the interests of the Departments, and in their capacity as his advisors.

The part of Congress in financial legislation must not be underestimated. It is Congress that frames the revenue bills and passes the revenue acts; it is Congress, therefore, that decides upon the financial policy of the country, both as to expenditure and as to revenue, so that the administrative budget must be presented to Congress in such form that it can act upon the estimates therein contained and in such form that the requests for expenditure and suggestions for revenue of the President can be compared with the final grants and taxes authorized by the Congress. Unless a comparison can be made, not merely as to the grand totals, but also as to the items, between the estimates and the appropriation acts, the public, the ultimate arbiter, will be in no position to decide which of the two is right and to throw the overpowering weight of its influence on one side or the other in case of a dispute. Consequently the form of the budget, especially that part which relates to estimates, will be largely controlled by the organization of the committees of Congress.

The Good bill to establish a budget, now before Congress, takes cognizance of the actual facts. Until Congress is ready to change its rules and so to organize that it can make use of a scientific budget, when that instrument is presented to it, it must receive the estimates so arranged as to respond to its needs. The presidential responsibility for the estimates, though not so easy under the present complicated scheme as under a simple and uniform plan, can be established for the items of expenditure requested, and upon the President in addition can be put the responsibility for balancing expenditure and revenue and for suggesting new taxes to cover deficit in revenue. This responsibility is put upon him in the Good bill and so the essential principle of administrative responsibility for estimates and for a balance between estimate and expenditure is established. To carry out this duty effectively, a force is given him which he can direct as he will, to make investigations in the administrative organization which shall disclose waste and inefficiency and which shall reduce requests for increases to the actual needs, with a result that committees of Congress need no longer waste so much time in quizzing bureau chiefs as to why they want four stenographers at $1,500, and whether three at $900, or one at $1,200 and one at $900, would not be sufficient. More time could then be given to the important items of expenditure and to the general policy of the committee.

Recognizing, however, that the present method of submitting the estimates is unsatisfactory, Mr. Good has provided in his bill for an experimental budget to be prepared on scientific lines by the President with the aid of his technical force and submitted to Congress at the next session in December. This budget will not be constructed from a theoretical standpoint, but will be made up by the men who have been going over the estimates, and for that purpose have been examining into the organization of the various Departments in Washington, so that they will have the practical experience and knowledge which fit them to apply scientific theory to this highly practical subject. With this budget before it, Congress can easily ascertain what changes in its rules and organization will be necessary, if it is to accept the budget proposed as its working statement of the revenue and expenditure needs of the Government. If it is ready to make the changes, it can easily establish the scientific budget as the sole budget to be presented.

The advantages of this procedure are manifest. Congress could not at the present time intelligently reorganize its committees and change its rules to accommodate its organization to a statement of expenditures and revenues whose form it does not know. Without careful examination of the subject, which will last at least till next December, Congress would probably be unwilling to adopt a budget bill which would set out the form of a scientific budget in sufficient detail to enable Congress to adjust its organization to the new requirements. There is, therefore, no delay involved in accepting Mr. Good's proposal, and there is the great advantage, even from the point of view of a scientific budget, that the preparation of a plan for submission to Congress will be made by men having a duty to perform which opens to them the departments of the Government. This duty, furthermore, is one which is directly connected with the financial matters which must be treated in the proposed experimental budget, so that theoretical ideas will be checked up by actual facts in the process of its formulation.

The interest of Congress in the expenses of the Government is not, however, limited to the passage of the appropriation bills. As guardians of the public purse, the members of Congress are interested in knowing that the sums appropriated are applied to the purposes for which they are expressly appropriated and that they are not wastefully or extravagantly used. It is extraordinary that up to the present time, no organ of government has been created which makes it possible for Congress to carry out this duty. The audit and control of government funds is vested in the comptroller of the treasury and six auditors, also connected with the Treasury Department, and, therefore, connected with and responsible to the executive and not to the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. Good's bill changes this undesirable situation in the simplest way possible, by creating the office of comptroller-general of the United States and by vesting in him all the powers of audit and control of the expenditure of the appropriations voted by Congress. He is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; but he is made entirely independent of the Executive, because he can be removed only at the request of Congress. He is further tied up to Congress by his duty to report directly to that body and to its committees, and an even closer relation is provided in that members of his staff may be detailed to sit with committees whenever they desire information on the accounts and expenditures of the Government.

A committee of Congress to function with the comptroller-general is also provided for, so that Congress will have not merely a general and indefinite but a direct means of communication with the important auditing department. Matters of general interest to the auditing of the accounts and to the methods of informing Congress in regard to the expenditures and revenues of the Government, as well as to the passage of the appropriation acts, will be studied by the committee as a basis for suggestion for their improvement.

It cannot be maintained that Mr. Good's bill is the last word in budget legislation. It must be remembered, however, that the first word must be spoken before the last

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

word can possibly be uttered; it is not on earth but in heaven that "the first shall be last." The act puts the responsibility for the annual estimates of revenue and expenditure upon the President, where it has not heretofore rested; it provides him with a force which will enable him to perform his duty, and justifies the placing upon him of the responsibility. It instructs him to prepare an experimental budget, which will show to Congress the way in which he believes the annual statements of the government finances should be presented to that body. It does not disturb the existing safeguards which Congress has thrown about estimates and appropriations until new safeguards can be devised and put into force. The bill does not change the procedure of Congress, its rules and the organization of its committees. This reorganization would be impossible, until the form of the new budget shall be decided, because the committee organization must conform to that of the estimates in the budget. If it is decided to handle the appropriations by different committees, the budget must be so arranged that it can easily be separated into its different parts and each part placed before the proper committee. If Congress decides to put the consideration of the budget into the hands of one committee with a number of sub-committees, these must conform to the plan of the budget.

For the information of the public, as well as for practical use in Congress, this must be so. If the public is to judge fairly between estimates submitted by the President and the appropriation or revenue bills reported out of committee and passed by Congress, the bills and the budget must be sufficiently coördinated so that not the totals alone but the items for the various important services can be distinguished and the treatment in each case by the President and by Congress can be paralleled.

In relation to the budget, Mr. Good's bill takes the first step and provides the means by which definite and full information may be supplied to Congress to enable it to complete the work begun. The same is true of the new department of accounts. The essential thing, the independent department, closely related to Congress, is established. Many further reforms, will be necessary in the accounting system of the Government before an ideal system of public control and accounts is in effect; but these reforms will follow necessarily from the first, and it is perhaps wise in legislation as in other paths of life to walk before you run.

A Conference Unrepentant*

By WILLIAM MACDONALD

Paris, May 30

"WHAT can I write about except the Peace Conference, and what can I write about that?" For there is really nothing of importance here except the peace. The coming and going of distinguished visitors, the preparations for the tourist flood, the slow reconstitution of industry in the former war areas, the debate over the new taxes, even the strikes which continue ominously to multiply—none of these things, nor all of them together, stir in the foreign observer more than a passing interest. One notes them in much the same way that one watches the afternoon parade on the boulevards—with a certain active attention to the moving spectacle of incident or color, and even, perhaps, with some resulting addition to one's knowledge of humanity and its ways, but with no deep concern after all. What really counts is the peace; and how can any thoughtful person speak of the peace with either satisfaction or hopefulness?

So far as the Peace Conference is concerned, the actual situation may best be described as anarchy. The effect of arbitrary usurpation of authority in dividing counsel and alienating support has never been more strikingly shown than in the results which have followed the monopolization of power by the Big Four. One searches in vain for clear evidence of controlling principle or central purpose other than the obliteration of Germany. Rarely does one meet an official of the Conference who professes more than formal satisfaction with anything that has been done, or who views the outcome with anything save anxious concern. Where one might expect to find confidence, hopefulness, and respect one finds instead disappointment, chagrin, a deep sense of irritation, and profound apprehension. Nine members of the American delegation have tendered their resignations, and four of them have already departed for the United States. Never was an international conference so utterly discredited among its own members while its work was in progress, or so openly denounced in the press, or so frankly repudiated by many of the peoples who are at once the subjects and the victims of its deliberations.

What makes matters worse is the fact that everybody, whether connected with the Conference or not, knows precisely what the trouble is and the hopelessness of applying remedies now. Everybody knows that the Allies were morally under obligation to make a Wilson peace—a peace which should embody not merely the substance of the Fourteen Points, but also, distinctly and particularly, the political ethics which Mr. Wilson had elaborated in his messages and addresses. Everybody knows that the peoples of Great Britain, France, and Italy, as well as those of other Allied countries, expected and demanded such a peace quite as much as ever did the people of the United States. Everybody knows that Germany was right in believing, and is right now in asserting and demanding, that the only peace that should be imposed is one which conforms strictly to Mr. Wilson's terms. And everybody knows that scarcely a trace of the ethical principles which Mr. Wilson advocated appears in the treaty which Germany has been told to sign. What has taken the life out of the Peace Conference, and made it a by-word and a reproach among all good men, is not that its machinery has been clumsy or its decisions faulty in detail, but that it has broken faith with the peoples and turned its back upon those whom it was morally bound to support. There is no question whatever about the obligation, and none whatever that the obligation has been ignored.

When one tries to probe the question of responsibility for this tragic collapse of hopes and political philosophies, it at once appears that everybody is prompt in throwing the blame upon someone else. The American will tell you that Mr. Wilson stood out for his principles to the point where

*The first of a regular series of articles by the Associate Editor of the *Nation* who has taken up the duties of chief European correspondent of this journal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further insistence would have upset the Governments of M. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George and opened for Europe the flood-gates of Bolshevism; that he fell among thieves who sought to strip him of his raiment, that the game was one which he did not know, and so forth and so on. The Britisher intimates that, aside from a rather serious difference of opinion regarding indemnities and reparations and a preliminary clash over the freedom of the seas, Great Britain has stood with the United States in opposition to the claims of France and Italy, and regrets as deeply as does America the unhappy plight which has overtaken the Peace Conference. Neither in British nor in American circles does one hear much that is favorable to France, although it is freely admitted that a clear distinction must be made between the Clemenceau Government, steeped in the memories of 1870-71 and supported by all the reactionary influences of wealth, class, politics, and trade, and the bourgeois socialists, the working-class syndicalists, and the peasants.

As a matter of fact, there is no good reason why any considerable number or any particular group of those who have had to do with the Paris Conference should be relieved from responsibility. However completely the Big Four may have arrogated power to themselves, the details of their plans have not only in most cases been worked out by their associates, but some of their weightiest decisions have followed upon reports prepared by some of the very experts who now express privately their deep dissatisfaction with the treaty. It would be idle to deny that practically all of these persons knew the details of the German treaty before the treaty was submitted, and were all in a position to have lodged vigorous protests had they chosen to do so. Until such protests are forthcoming, the members of the staffs must go to trial before public opinion with their chiefs. Nor can the British plead in extenuation the stubborn insistence of M. Clemenceau upon his reactionary programme or the moral obligation of the secret agreements with Italy.

Now, however, one hears it said, the German treaty is likely to be revised. The Big Four have been listening, and before the swelling tide of opposition in England and America the arbitrators of a world's destiny, it is reported, have begun to tremble. There is fear of a revival of pro-Germanism in the United States. A fifteen years' military occupation of German territory is not easily stomached. The demand of the United States Senate for the separation of the League of Nations covenant from the rest of the treaty, and the possibility that even so the treaty may be radically amended or rejected altogether, have given a rude shock to the self-satisfied Four. Moreover, the counter-propositions of Count von Brockdorf-Rantzau and his associates, accompanied as they have been by pertinent references to the speeches of Mr. Wilson and others which their authors appear conveniently to have forgotten or perhaps to have regarded as no longer applicable, are proving uncomfortably hard reading, especially for the American delegation; and the opinion is widely prevalent that some substantial concessions will have to be made if the treaty is not to fail, not only among the Germans, but, what would be much more humiliating, in the house of the nations which have fashioned it.

There should be no illusions about the immediate future, however. There is no new spirit at Paris. The same Big Four who have dominated the situation thus far still dominate it, and the forces upon which they rely for support are still solidly behind them. There is among them no more of generosity or of genuine regard for the people than there has been all along, and the only concessions will be such as may be deemed expedient, not to right essential wrongs that have been done, but to prevent too open a manifestation of discontent. The methods, too, are as unchanged as is the character of the personnel. The same wretched policy of high-handedness, secrecy, and subterfuge which has obtained from the beginning obtains now. The reactionary press still heaps abuse daily upon the German proposals and protests loudly against the least concession to the Hun. The Big Four still meet in secret, and the proceedings of the plenary sessions are made known only through official communiqués. The French censorship continues in unabated rigor, popular impression to the contrary notwithstanding. With printed texts of the treaty, in French, German, and English, openly sold in Germany and Holland and circulated from hand to hand in Paris itself, and with official copies lying upon the table in almost every office which you enter, the treaty is still withheld from the press, and copies are denied to the Chamber of Deputies, the House of Commons, and the American Senate. The last reply of the German delegation is known to the public only through a few brief extracts, at the same time that favored newspapers appear to have seen the text. Only the other day, with the latest German note in hand and the reports of public feeling abroad more disturbing than ever, the Big Four nevertheless went on with their plan of submitting to the Austrian delegation a part of the Austrian treaty without communicating its contents to the Jugoslavs and others who are most deeply concerned in its provisions; and they would actually have done so had not M. Bratiano, on behalf of the various nationalities affected, demanded a delay until the document could be examined. As it is, the draft which it is now planned to present on Monday is shorn of the financial, economic, and military sections, which are being withheld. Nor is this all; there are signs of revolt within the Conference states themselves. The so-called "Powers with limited interests," such as the Jugoslavs and the Rumanians, have protested against the provision of the treaty under which the various ethnical minorities contained within the territories of new states which have been or are to be created are to be placed under the protection of the League of Nations, on the ground that no such principle is to be applied to similar minorities in the territories of the Great Powers, and that such assumption of protection works a limitation of sovereignty. From the standpoint of self-determination the argument is unanswerable, but, according to the Paris edition of the *New York Herald*, both Mr. Wilson and M. Clemenceau urged "that as the Great Powers had lost more than the others by the war, they had the right to lay down principles which they know to be vital."

There is nothing to be hoped for from a body which continues to pursue so blind a policy. Serious as would undoubtedly be the situation which would be created were the treaty to fail, opinion is unquestionably growing in Paris that it no longer makes much difference whether the treaty is accepted or not. No concessions now will restore the moral principle which the treaty has lacked from the beginning, or enable any member of the Big Four to explain more convincingly the part which he has had in framing it. As one of the most distinguished statesmen, not an American, now in Paris said to me a day or two ago: "The treaty has been wrong from the start. The only thing to do is to have done with it as soon as possible, and to begin again."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Child Massacre as a Political Weapon

By NORMAN ANGELL

WHEN the Germans sank the Lusitania and slew several hundred women and children, *we* knew—at least we thought we knew—that that was the kind of thing which Englishmen or Americans could not do. In all the hates and stupidities, the dirt and heartbreaks of the war there was just this light on the horizon: that there were certain things to which we at least could never fall, in the name of victory or patriotism or any other of the deadly masked words that are "the unjust stewards of man's ideas."

And then we did it. We, too, sank Lusitanias. We, too, for some cold political end, plunged the unarmed, the weak, the helpless, the children, the suffering women to agonizing death and torture—without a tremor. Not alone in the bombing of cities, which we did so much better than the enemy. For this we had the usual excuse—it was war. "*They* killed my sister," said a young Allied aviator starting on his bombing raid. They? The little children whom his bombs tore to pieces, the little girls whom he blinded and maimed? Had they killed his sister? Let that pass. But after the war, when the fighting was finished, the enemy was disarmed, his submarines were surrendered, his aeroplanes destroyed, his soldiers dispersed—months afterwards, we kept a weapon which was for use first and mainly against the children, the weak, the sick, the old, the women, the mothers, the decrepit: starvation and disease. Our papers told us—our patriotic papers—how well it was succeeding. Correspondents wrote complacently, sometimes exultingly, of how thin and pinched were all the children, even those well into their teens; how stunted, how defective the next generation would be; and how, among the younger children, those of seven and eight looked like children of three or four, and how those beneath this age simply did not live. Either they were born dead, or, if they were born alive—what was there to give them? Milk? An unheard-of luxury. And there was nothing to wrap them in; even in hospitals the new-born children were wrapped in newspapers, the lucky ones in bits of sacking. The mothers were most fortunate when the children were born dead. In an insane asylum a mother wails: "If only I did not hear the cry of the children for food all day long, all day long." You see, to "bring Germany to reason" by such means we must drive mothers out of their reason.

A falsehood? Exaggeration? Listen to an English Cabinet Minister—one of the old English political order, bearing a great historical name—Mr. Churchill, speaking months after the armistice, in the House of Commons, on March 3:

> We are enforcing the blockade with rigor. . . . This weapon of starvation falls mainly upon the women and children, upon the old, the weak and the poor, after all the fighting has stopped.

Oh, but not to the extent of causing thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of little helpless children to suffer and cry through the long nights, to drive women insane with it—*that* is German propaganda. Well, here is a witness: the Berlin correspondent of the *Daily Express*, perhaps the most ferociously patriotic, German-hating, Hun-baiting paper in England. This is his testimony:

> The Germans have killed British and French babies, so I suppose one should have no qualms about killing off a few thousand German babies and their mothers in a fecund state. I made earnest inquiries concerning childbirth among women of the poorer classes of Berlin, and I verified the statements I obtained. Seventy per cent. of expectant mothers are horribly undernourished, and when they are taken to lying-in hospitals they are in a starving condition. Because of their situation they are unable to stand in food lines in order to obtain the small food rations allowed them. These women steal all the food they can, and I have seen them rummaging through dust-bins to find potato peelings. . . . I have encountered dozens of children two years of age who have never tasted milk. Children born just before the war seem in fairly good condition, but those born since Armageddon was let loose on the world are shrivelled-up creatures. The men say . . . they will not be slaves of the Entente; the factories are idle because there are no raw materials, and yet these people do not understand that they have been beaten. They are in a state of despair and see nothing in front of them but black misery.

"It would have been more merciful," said Bob Smillie, the miners' leader, "to turn the machine guns on those children." Put this question to yourself, patriot-Englishman, patriot-American: Was the sinking of the Lusitania as cruel, as prolonged, as mean, as merciless a death as this? And we—you and I—do it every day, every night. Here is the *Times* of May 21, half a year after the cessation of war, telling the Germans that they do not know how much more severe we can still make the "domestic results" of starvation if we really put our mind to it. To the blockade we shall add "the horrors of invasion." The invasion of a country already disarmed is to be marked—according to our threats—by horror.

But the purpose! That justifies it. What purpose? To obtain the signature to the treaty of peace. Many Englishmen—not pacifists, not sentimentalists, but bishops, judges, members of the House of Lords, great public educators, Tory editors—and many Americans have declared that this treaty is a monstrous injustice. But if the Germans say so, that becomes a crime which we shall know how to punish. "The enemy have been reminded already," says the *Times*, proud organ of British respectability, of conservatism, of distinguished editors and ennobled proprietors, "that the machinery of the blockade can again be put into force at a few hours' notice . . . Rejection of the peace terms now offered them will assuredly lead to fresh chastisement."

"Fresh chastisement"—some great artist should interpret the editorial warning for the better instruction of German mothers and fathers: a vast sea of small, deadly white, skinny faces, and then finally long, unending lines of little tiny graves. Germany will sign. "Gentlemen of England and America, Messieurs les Français, you have us. Oh, decidedly you have us. We yield. *That* is why we sign." Suppose they add that postscript to this famous treaty? And what is the value of a signature so enforced and so explained? The value? Will not Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Wilson be able to bring back those signatures? Will they not have "made peace"—permanent peace? Shall we not have destroyed this Prussian philosophy of frightfulness, force and hate? Shall we not have proved to the world that a state without military power can trust to the good faith and humanity of its neighbors? Can we not then celebrate victory with light hearts, honor our dead and glorify our arms? Have we not served faithfully those ideals of right and justice, mercy and chivalry for which a whole generation of youth went through hell and gave their lives?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lanier as a Poet of Nature

By NORMAN FOERSTER

I.

"CORN," "The Song of the Chattahoochee," "The Marshes of Glynn," "Sunrise" are Lanier's best poems, and at the same time are poems of nature; as poet, even as musician, Lanier found his subjects in nature. And as a poet of nature, he happily does what none of his predecessors had done, Poe least of all—he presents with some adequacy the Southern scene. Although not all of the South is to be found in his work, he gives us perhaps as much as any poet can present sympathetically. He had travelled, says his biographer, from San Antonio to Jacksonville, and from Baltimore to Mobile Bay; and wherever he went his eye and heart seized the mood of the landscape as only a true poet's eye and heart can. River and seashore, fields of corn and of cotton, marshes and foothills and mountains, he loved them all. His projected "Hymns of the Mountains," like most of the work that he planned, never came to be, but at least two remarkable "Hymns of the Marshes" are among his fragmentary "remains," and they are enough to constitute him the poet of the marshes. In his letters as in his poems we glimpse again and again the "romantic" Southern scene, full of light and cheer, with its snowy cotton-fields and shining corn, its red soil glowing beneath green pines and blue sky, its farmhouses under the airy sycamores, its redbirds and wrens and mockingbirds, its singing negroes, its mules, its very corn-pone and snap-beans.

Most of all he loved the scene of his boyhood and youth at Macon, and other parts of Georgia that he came to know later, especially, of course, the marshes by the sea. The beauty of Macon won him from the start—the river, the great groves of oaks, the hills rising above the town. The gentle hills, with their constant variety and surprise, attracted him more perhaps than anything else; they were, as he pointed out, a happy compromise between the mountain ruggedness to the northwest and the monotonous seaboard levels to the southeast. At the "'Cademy" he managed to combine with his studies "deep draughts of the love of nature from the cool, solacing oaks." His was a happy boyhood in a cultivated and fairly prosperous family, with town sociabilities and country solitudes always at his disposal. A resident of Macon describes "the boundless hospitality of those times—a continual round of entertainments, musicales, and evening parties, . . . horseback rides and boat rides during the day and piano-playing, singing, fluting, and impromptu cotillions and Virginia reels in the evening!" Books, too, were at his command, the best books, and he continued to read eagerly, as well as to master his studies.

Then there came to this remote college town and to this "spare-built boy" (so he describes himself) "of average height and underweight, mostly addicted to hard study, long reveries, and exhausting smokes with a German pipe," the impossible crash of cannon and the call to arms. Lanier fared forth, in the first Georgia company to go to Virginia, his dream of life as an idyll shattered forever.

Nature, music, books, all were now sacrificed. It is true that the war deepened his personality, which needed contact with the actual world, and that, after the war, he rose to the national point of view while most contemporary poets, North and South, remained sectional. Yet if the war brought on his fatal disease, as he believed it did, one must doubt whether the gain offset the loss. For his life became a heroic, unremitting struggle against poverty and disease, a struggle against odds that would have brought most men to the grave in a few years, odds that he, however, faced successfully in his eagerness to secure happiness through self-expression. Outwardly and inwardly his life was frantic; the deathbed composition of "Sunrise," one of his most remarkable poems, is symbolical. The visible result of such a life is destined to be pitifully inadequate: as the most harmonious hours of his life were mixed with discords, so his best poetry, his poetry of nature, is marred by glaring defects; and these defects perhaps forbid his classification with the foremost American writers on nature. Still, he contributes, as we have noted, what none of them contribute —the scenery of the South; and he alone reveals a musician's feeling for nature.

II.

Lanier's earliest playmates, so to speak, were the birds, the flowers, the trees of Georgia. In his poems, however, he names few birds, and of these few none are quite adequately presented. The mockingbird, whose fit praises are yet to be sung, he celebrated in a studied sonnet; and the mourning dove, apparently his only other favorite, he described accurately rather than tellingly. His flowers (something like a dozen) are mainly decorative and illustrative. Most frequent are the violet and the lily, the flowers of sentimentalism as the dove is the bird of sentimentalism. Best of his poems on flowers is "Corn"—if one may classify it thus—the poem of the "stately corn-stalks" sixty miles north of Macon on the uplands within sight of the lower ranges of the Blue Ridge Mountains. As in most of Lanier's poetry, fancy tends to supplant imagination (the hill, for instance, being a "gashed and hairy Lear" that Spring, his Cordelia, cannot cheer), and diffuse phrasing weakens the feeling. But, with all its lack of emotional governance, it has a certain largeness, a sense of insight and far vision, not perhaps always justified by a close examination, that brings one back to it gladly, but one does not soon forget that intense picture across the vale

> To where, beyond the mouldering mill,
> Yon old deserted Georgian hill
> Bares to the sun his piteous aged crest
> And seamy breast,
> By restless-hearted children left to lie
> Untended there beneath the heedless sky,
> As barbarous folk expose their old to die.

"Corn," like most of Lanier's best work, begins with a forest rhapsody. The feeling may be overwrought and sentimental, but beneath the restless striving for sensation and for expression is a strong deep love of trees such as one finds rarely in literature. In the dreaming beeches, in the young hickories ecstatic with urgency of burgeoning, in the great pines inwreathed with winding muscadines, in old companies of oaks forming high overhead a

> veined complex of space
> Where sky and leafage interlace
> So close, the heaven of blue is seen
> Inwoven with a heaven of green;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—in all the trees of the forest he sees various beauty, hears "fragmentary whispers" and "vague purports sweet," feels the lingering touch of leaves like women's hands, and under and among them lives a new life.

In "The Marshes of Glynn" nearly fifty lines are given to a celebration of the live-oak woods from whose eloquent glooms he emerges to the sand beach only at the end of a whole day of delight and elevation among them: of delight among their intricate beauties of form and color, and elevation through their intoxicating yet easing purity of soul, for they are

> Pure with a sense of the passing of saints through the wood.

Still longer is the opening passage of "Sunrise." The whispering leaves of the live-oak will not let him sleep; they bring "a message of range and of sweep"; and he goes.

> I have come ere the dawn, O beloved, my live-oaks, to hide
> In your gospelling glooms,—to be
> As a lover in heaven.

In his eager response he embraces the "burly-bark'd, manbodied Tree" in the dark, and the tears rain from his eyes to the foot of the tree, and he calls upon the

> Friendly, sisterly, sweetheart leaves

(nature being all in all to him) to give him light and guidance and to pray for him "a myriad prayer." In its undisciplined passion the whole passage reminds one of Richard Jefferies's uxorious love of nature.

III.

As he felt toward the trees, so Lanier felt toward nature generally. Rightly understood, he says, she is more than Ariel and Ceres to Prospero, more than a wood-fetching Caliban to serve us—she is a "friend and comforter," and she is sweetly companionable, he suggests, even when we remember Death with Mr. Darwin. That is his statement in written prose, and very likely his spoken word would have been to the same effect; but in his poems his eagerness led him further. Here he commonly addresses nature as a woman loved. She is his "sweetheart"; he is her "lover." He justifies himself historically:

> . . . a sweet Voice *Love thy neighbor* said;
> . . . . . .
> So, when man's arms had encircled all man's race,
> The liberal compass of his warm embrace
> Stretched bigger yet in the dark bounds of space;
> With hands agrope he felt smooth Nature's grace,
> Drew her to breast and kissed her sweetheart face.

That is the Christianity of a very loose constructionist; it is also the spirituality of a soul ever defeated yet ever aflame. His feeling for nature, like that of Jefferies, is in large measure the result of poverty, disease, and a desolating sense of defeat. Like Jefferies, he came to associate happiness with nature, misery with man; his hectic delight and abandon constituted a reaction against the trials of man as a social creature. Coming to the city he is not only dazed, like most countrymen, but repelled. "I tell you," he writes to a friend, "the Heavens are alien to this town, and if it were anybody else but the Infinite God that owned them, he wouldn't let them bend so blue over here." During the years in which he wrote most of his poetry, nature was to Lanier mainly a refuge from the trials that he associated with his life in the midst of men. At West Chester, where he wrote "The Waving of the Corn," he lay

> Stretched prone in summer's mortal ecstasy

and addressed society with the bitterness of a nature foiled:

> Ye terrible Towns, ne'er claim the trembling soul
> That, craftless all to buy or hoard or sell,
> From out your deadly complex quarrel stole
> To company with large amiable trees.

Amid spaces unbounded, the prisoned soul could find liberation and ecstasy in an expansive union with a great, wide scene. It is "a message of range and of sweep" that the live-oak leaves bring from the marsh and the main as he lies asleep, and he responds with a lover's haste. It is the "range and sweep" of these Marsh Hymns, incidentally, that make them memorable.

Another freedom, that of art, he found refuge in from boyhood to the end. To be sure, art is also an exacting despot, or should be; but to Lanier it meant first of all unfettered self-expression in a world where *his* self, at least, was painfully confined.

As a boy, Lanier learned to play, virtually without tuition, every accessible kind of instrument—flute, piano, organ, guitar, banjo, violin. The violin stirred him as did no other instrument. "He has related that during his college days it would sometimes so exalt him in rapture, that presently he would sink from his solitary music-worship into a deep trance, thence to awake, alone, on the floor of his room, sorely shaken in nerve." But the instrument that he mastered was the flute. In "Tiger Lilies" he wrote of flute playing: "It is like walking in the woods, amongst wild flowers, just before you go into some vast cathedral. For the flute seems to me to be particularly the woods-instrument: it speaks the gloss of green leaves or the pathos of bare branches; it calls up the strange mosses that are under dead leaves; it breathes of wild plants that hide and oak fragrances that vanish." Here, as often in his poems and letters, music and nature are interwoven. He was a convinced supporter of "programme-music," even a creator of it. If the true musician is the artist who thinks and feels in terms of pure sound, certainly Lanier was no musician, for always the sound evoked mental images, usually images from nature. In one of his letters written in Baltimore, for example, he describes an orchestra concert in which he took part as flute player. After picturing the "Hunt of Henry IV," with its dainty lady, and cavaliers, and horn, and dogs, and pistol, and the stag dying "in a celestial concord of flutes, oboes, and violins," he exclaims: "Oh, how far off my soul was in this thrilling moment. It was in a rare, sweet glen in Tennessee, the sun was rising over a wilderness of mountains,"—and he goes on to present an incident from which he says he was called back to his work as first flute player by the *bâton* and shouts and fanfares and gallopings "to the death."

IV.

In his "Poets of America" Stedman describes Lanier as "the Southerner nervous and eager, with dark hair and silken beard, features delicately moulded, pallid complexion, hands of the slender, white, artistic type." It is a vivid bit of description; but the epithet "Southerner" is scarcely suitable. He is, rather, a romanticist of a certain familiar type, aspiring, versatile, sensitive, expansive, devoted to beauty, repelled by modern life, capable, it would seem, of the highest happiness, but doomed, by disease and care, to enjoy the most fragmentary happiness and to suffer keenly. The conflict between head and heart that manifests itself in the romantic temperament throughout Lanier's century, he waged, too, as he indicates in "Acknowledgement":

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

O Age that half believ'st thou half believ'st,
Half doubt'st the substance of thine own half doubt,
And, half perceiving that thou half perceivest,
Stand'st at thy temple door, heart in, head out!

A body broken with disease, an emotional life lofty but rampant, and a mind incapable of bringing into harmony the parts of his nature—such was his endowment. But he had also genuine imagination and a love of all lovely things, and he knew how to give shape, even if not perfect shape, to his vision.

The Parallel of Revolution

By LINCOLN COLCORD

WHILE Europe pauses on the brink of the economic abyss, and while our leaders at Paris, the best that the present order of democracy could produce, are concluding the demonstration of their unfitness to govern the world, it behooves us to have in mind a clear view of what has already happened and a dispassionate vision of what logically is to come. For the whole situation is eminently logical. It is necessary only to be quite simple-minded, and to remember the first principles of universal human nature. Then we see how absurdly simple the present riddle of Europe is—how old, too. The whole history of humanity seems to cluster about that same riddle; over and over again, in blood and anguish, its answer has been written into the records of races and empires. Men dig it up on tablets, out of the mouldering ruins of prehistoric days. If the earth could suddenly become vocal with all its aching story of human life, that riddle, that answer, would rise above the rest in tremendous and mournful cadence. The riddle is the conflict between arbitrary authority and intrinsic authority, between the self and the spirit, between the wrong and the right. The answer lies in the historic danger of victory. He who triumphs must beware lest he put on the cloak of the vanquished. The true and final victory is over self; it must be won and held, lest it elude the grasp of the conqueror and pass into the hands of him who has lost the battle and found his soul. The ancient truth, the lesson of the ages—and still it is not learned.

Germany seems about to enter the same violent period of proletarian revolution that came to Russia. All the news heralds it, all the material and human factors are prepared. When this happens, the Peace Conference at Paris will disintegrate, its works will be scattered to the four winds, and a wholly new alignment of ideas and forces will take place. The scene will be revealed in a new light, and it will be apparent to everyone that the works of the Peace Conference were from the first a futile business, that they dealt only with the shadow and neglected the substance. They left the real problem practically untouched. That problem demands a hearing. It cannot be held back; for it is concerned with the sustenance of life, with the simple bread and wine, with growth and toil, with hunger and despair. Millions of men are holding their arms up to the sky. They are asking God the question, "How to live?" Love urges them, and nothing can stand in their way.

How can these hideous things have come about? It cannot be possible that Germany will succumb to Bolshevism, say some. The German people are stolid and docile; they have been educated in discipline. Germany is not an agricultural country, with a tenant peasantry. She has a more extensive bourgeoisie than Russia. The German character is altogether different from the Russian. How long will such superficial observations continue to govern men's opinions? Cannot they see that this is no longer a question of national or racial differences of character, but rather of the universal fundamentals of human nature? All people react to hunger or oppression in the same way. Under the same conditions the German character will succumb to Bolshevism quite as easily, in precisely the same way, and for precisely the same reason, as did the Russian people. It is an anomaly that Bolshevism gained its first success in an agricultural land. Industrialism is the natural home of Bolshevism; it is in industrialized communities, in direct proportion to their industrialization, that the revolutionary principle can appear most quickly and flourish most strongly—if the economic crisis is induced by those who govern and control.

That crisis definitely has been precipitated in Germany, by the policies of Paris. The course of the Russian Revolution is likely to be followed to the bitter and terrible end. And because Germany has a more extensive bourgeoisie than Russia, the revolution may be only the more terrible, in its wrongs, its misunderstandings, and its violence. The German revolution now stands at the close of its Kerensky period; it is in September of 1917. The fatal parallel between the two revolutions extends even to origins and potentialities.

In Russia, first, there was economic exhaustion, the breakdown of the life-processes of the nation. These induced the first revolution—at once a revolt against the authority which had created the situation and a protest against the continuance of Russia in the war. For a brief period, authority passed to the Provisional Government, to the hands of those who stood nearest the governmental machinery, and whose names were most familiar to the multitude. This was the Lvoff-Miliukov régime, the leaders of which were liberal nationalists, capitalists, and imperialists. They did not in any measure represent the aims of the revolution; and as soon as their policies began to be revealed, the revolution reasserted itself; they lost the confidence of the people, and were quickly supplanted. Then commenced a period lasting through the summer of 1917, which may broadly be termed the Kerensky period. The leadership during this period was vested in the conservative Socialists—men who, under the pressure of responsibility, estimated the situation wrongly, attempted to revive the spirit of militarism, and showed a tendency to compromise with the more powerful evils. The Russian people were at a loss; they themselves did not fully know what they wanted; and it took them a longer time than before to see that the fundamental aims of the revolution were not being fulfilled. These fundamental aims were bread, peace, and work; they directly involved the revision of the imperialistic war aims of the Allies, and this involved the ending of the Great War. It is now perfectly apparent, first, that nothing short of a complete revision of the Allied war aims would have served to save the Kerensky régime;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second, that this would not have accomplished its purpose unless Kerensky had also abandoned the attempt to revive militarism and had recognized the authority of the Soviets; and third, that the natural and logical time for the ending of the Great War had come in the summer of 1917.

These things were being pointed out to Russia by the more radical and outright leaders, Lenine and Trotzky; in October of 1917, when the Russian people had become convinced of the failure of Kerensky, the power vested in the Soviets automatically fell into their hands. The Allies and America were primarily responsible, through their failure to square the actual aims of the war with their ostensible professions, and through their insistence that Kerensky maintain a sham and support a hypocrisy. Then came the Brest-Litovsk peace with Germany. Again Lenine and Trotzky correctly interpreted the aims of the Revolution, again the Allies and America refused to face the issue. The Russian bourgeoisie—the leaders of the Lvoff-Miliukov régime, and now the leaders, also, of the Kerensky régime—cried out against this action as a betrayal of the Allies and America, and demanded that Russia remain in the war. But, in truth, it was the Allies and America who had betrayed the Russian Revolution—it was the Russian Revolution which was trying to save the spirit of the war. In order to do this, the revolution had been driven to its most radical extreme. The Russian proletariat demanded peace at any price, in the confidence that an imperialistic peace could not be enforced, in the faith that such a peace would leap the lines of the enforcing armies and bring about the revolution in Germany.

And this, in sober fact, was what took place: the real downfall of Germany was induced from within. It was because the economic and political morale of the nation broke behind the lines, that the military morale broke on the western front. Not radicals and revolutionists alone, but men like Hoffmann and Ludendorff, have testified conclusively to this fact. So the German revolution finally did occur.

Let us look into the manner of its occurrence. Exactly as in Russia, there was the background of economic exhaustion. The first step upward, as it were, from the autocracy, was taken through the Government of Prince Maximilian of Baden, a régime directly comparable in its leadership and essentials to that of Lvoff and Miliukov in Russia. The revolution, however, had actually been accomplished by the action of very radical forces—by the appearance of the Soviet movement in the large cities and among the troops; and with the aims of this revolution the Government of Prince Max had little in common. As soon as the revolution settled into its bearings, its original aims were reasserted, and the régime of Prince Max was supplanted. The conservative Socialist leaders, Ebert and Scheidemann, now stepped into power, and with constantly waning support have managed to maintain their position up to the present time. They have followed precisely the tactics and policies of the Kerensky régime in Russia, and have revealed the same characteristics. They are men who profess the doctrine of the revolution, but who do not put it into practice; they are men who have estimated the situation wrongly, who have failed to reckon with the real source of their authority, and who, as they feel that authority weakening, turn instinctively back to militarism and the creation of an arbitrary authority. Their régime, like that of Kerensky, is one in which the people are bewildered, in which the proletarian revolution is being driven to its most radical extreme in order that it may accomplish its expression.

The potentialities of the present situation in Germany are precisely those of the Russian situation in the fall of 1917. The people are demanding bread, peace, and work. Their triumphant enemies are preparing to impose upon Germany a peace more imperialistic than the peace of Brest-Litovsk. The German bourgeoisie—the leaders of the old régime, of the provisional régime, and now of the conservative Socialist régime—rebel against this peace, refuse to sign it, and call for a revival of militarism and a return to the condition of war. The proletarian movement, under the leadership of Haase, advocates peace at any price, in the confidence that the peace of Paris cannot be enforced, in the faith that such an effort would leap the lines of the enforcing armies and bring about revolution within the enemy countries. It is logically inevitable that the Ebert-Scheidemann Government shall very soon be supplanted by an Independent Socialist Government under Haase, as in Russia the Kerensky régime was supplanted by that of Lenine and Trotzky. Haase speaks for the people, for the real aims of the revolution; and when the people have sufficiently lost faith in Ebert and Scheidemann, authority will be thrust into Haase's hands. And Haase may sign the peace of Paris as Lenine signed the peace of Brest-Litovsk.

It is obvious that, throughout this second great revolutionary manifestation, the parallel holds also with respect to the dominating factor of Allied and American policy. In Russia, it was the imperialistic war aims of the Allies, supported by America; in Germany, it is these war aims, still supported by America, reduced to the terms of peace which are to be imposed. Nothing would have saved Kerensky but the revision of these war aims; nothing would save Ebert and Scheidemann but the revision of these terms. There was no intention of revising the war aims; there is no intention of revising the terms. The war actually was an imperialistic war, and now stands revealed as such beyond denial or evasion. Its aims are to be accomplished by force, to be imposed by the power of arbitrary authority. Thus the arguments of the revolution are justified, and its development is driven forward.

One further item remains, a break in the parallel. The Russian proletariat at Brest-Litovsk had little but faith to build upon in the German situation. At Paris, the German proletariat finds more to encourage its hopes. The proletariat everywhere has already registered its outspoken opposition to the treaty of Paris, even before that treaty has been signed. Some men are saying that Germany is helpless, that she will have no alternative but to sign the treaty. They are wholly misjudging the situation, and are thinking of it in the wrong set of terms. The men they expect to sign the treaty may refuse to sign it; the treaty may be signed by other men, for other reasons than they suppose. And when it is signed, it cannot be enforced; that is, the attempt to enforce it would break the back of the Allies and precipitate the revolution throughout Europe. Thus, so far from being helpless, Germany has the whip hand in the situation. She has it because our leaders have led us astray.

We are not celebrating the revolution; we follow its development with sinking heart, in the conviction that civilization has failed to fulfil its destiny. But there is no virtue in evasion, no hope in prejudice, no salvation in ignorance. As the facts stand, so should we humbly and candidly examine them.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Summer Rain

By MARIE EMILIE GILCHRIST

IT is a windless night. The summer rain
Falls gently with an even, singing sound
Upon the trees that roof the quiet street,
And all my tired soul is taken thrall
By fragrances that rise to meet the rain:
The scent of sun-warmed dust now wet and flowing;
The scent of parching stones that suck each drop
Into their gray, foot-hollowed surfaces;
Green thirsty gardens, full of flower faces—
Drenched, brimming chalices of cool delight;
And then the smell of short, sweet, sunburnt grass
That finds an Eastertide in every rain;
The scent of cedars, resinous and stinging,
And Balm o' Gilead poplars by the gate;
The pungent fern-like smell of heavy branches
Whose leaves are flattened one against the other
And glisten in the arc-light's swaying circle—
Green stooping branches, strung with pendent jewels—
Spell-bound I stand within their woven shelter
And lose myself in time-transcending rapture.

In the Driftway

ONE of Professor Palmer's most devoted students, who carried his altruism through life and into death, was a young Armenian who was taking his doctorate at Harvard. The Drifter remembers the devout tone in which he said: "My heart kneels before my beloved teacher. I long to kiss his noble brow. Do you think he would lay his hand in blessing on my head?" Professor Palmer gave him the blessing his Oriental spirit craved, and the giver must have shared the consecration. Kevork Tourian was faithful to his trust, sharing the love which is "the joint service of a common life" and that higher "public love to which we are summoned" which Professor Palmer calls justice. The gentle Armenian student became Bishop of Trebizond and, together with ten thousand of his fellow-Christians, fell a martyr at the hands of the Turks.

* * * * *

THE children of New York's public schools have been treated to the following examination:

(a) Who are the Russian Bolsheviki and what are their aims?

(b) Do you believe the following principles to be in accord with or in opposition to these aims:

1. Rule by the majority.
2. Progress under law.
3. The right of each person to the product of his efforts.
4. Encouragement of individual initiative.

(Give in each case the reason for your belief.)

The Drifter offers his cheerful coöperation in this enlightened movement and suggests that the following questions be put before Manhattan's infants at a very early date:

a. What are the Genevan Calvinists and what are their aims?

b. Do you believe the following principles to be in accord with or in opposition to these aims?

1. Salvation by predestination.
2. Infant damnation.
3. Ministerial hierarchy.
4. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decrees.

(Give in each case the reason for your belief.)

THE Drifter watches the Boy Scouts swing along the Avenue and his memory leaps back to his early enthusiasm for the Children's Crusade, when he fed his fancy with dreams of the little shepherd boy leaving his flocks in the moonlit pastures and the children acclaiming him at the cathedral door and answering his call to the Cross with a joyous shout. There were scenes aplenty to stir the imagination in that colossal tragedy of childhood. It was a shock to the Drifter when he grew old enough to realize the worst bitterness of that tragedy—from the appearance of the "angel" (or was it priest?) in Stephen's vision, down to the "two noble Christian merchants," who sold the weary children into slavery in heathen lands, it was a fabric of exploitation of the little ones by those who had them in their care. The wicked world was to be saved by the martyrdom of its innocents. It is a world-old habit and will die hard—this of trying to save a lost cause by the sacrifice of all our hopes for the future. The spiritual romance of the Children's Crusade has departed, but the children are still being shaped to meet the purposes of their elders, who have failed themselves and yet would burden the young world with their accumulated fears and hates. They would sterilize the children's minds and reduce their mental rations to uniformly limited portions. A proprietary interest in established institutions is fostered under the name of thrift. The child who thinks for himself is already a menace; the boy who declines to play the spy on his teachers is no patriot. Shall we continue to turn them out, true to pattern, by the 300,000? Shall we tell them that only by conforming to type can they save our precious civilization? Shall we allow them not even the inspiring white robe of the crusader, but band them in well-disciplined "non-military" khaki? Or shall we leave them the freedom of childhood and the dreams of youth?

* * * * *

WHEN the armistice burst upon us it spoiled many plans of mice and men. The mice were the ones to profit; also the odd million cats who make an honest living on New York's ash-barrels. It began with the good intentions of a kind-hearted lady who wanted to do her bit. The Drifter is now able to give the details of her charitable scheme. Perhaps some anti-Bolshevist organization will still welcome the suggestions. As we all know, an enormous amount of food is wasted every day in these happy United States. Potato-peelings, the tops of onions, the outside leaves of cabbages and salads, eggs that are not so fresh as they might be, are mercilessly discarded. These waste materials of our culinary plenty go into what is vulgarly called the garbage-can. While they are being consumed by the aforementioned cats and mice, vast multitudes of people go hungry. If they could only get at the potato-peelings and the cabbage-leaves they might make themselves a wholesome and palatable salad. The eggs would do for simple appetites not weakened by a French cuisine. A stew of discarded chicken bones and shredded cabbage-leaves is heartening during the cold days of winter. The intelligent reader may see what the charitable and inventive lady intended to accomplish. She was going to bring the hungry poor and the over-plentiful ashcan together. A special patriotic organization was to be founded—the American society to feed the war-poor on the war-refuse of the war-rich. What a perfect genius for organization we Yankees have!

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

The Preaching of Hate

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Dr. Henry Van Dyke, in the *Nation* of June 7, takes exception to my statement that he has preached bitterness and hate. He goes further and accuses me publicly of having "deliberately" misrepresented him and of having uttered a "falsehood," unless, perchance, in my characterization of his preaching, I spoke rashly on misleading newspaper reports.

My statement was based on a sermon which I heard him preach last autumn at Trinity Church, Boston. In interpreting his spirit then I was interpreting conscientiously the vivid impression which I received in listening to him. His letter to the *Nation* seems to me to confirm this impression. Though he says in it: "I have never preached hatred against the German people. They were bamboozled and misled to support the Potsdam gang," he also says in the same paragraph: "Now they (the German people) must confess and repent their fault and bring forth fruits meet for repentance. They must restore what they have taken, repair all the damage they have done and be bound over to keep the peace in future. If they will do this, they have the undoubted right to live as a people. Otherwise—not!"

I submit that in this assumption of the right to determine that the German people must either repent or be exterminated, must either repair "all" damage—an obvious impossibility—or lose the right to live, Dr. Van Dyke again shows bitterness and hatred towards millions of people whose offense, according to him, was merely that they had been bamboozled and misled.

He closes his letter to you thus:—"The question remains now as it was in the beginning. Are you pro-German and pacifist, or do you love a righteous peace well enough to fight for it and put it through?" This question is typical, but seems to me irrelevant. The argument *ad hominem*, the insistence on opprobrious epithets, "pro-German" and "pacifist" being a natural resort, and the implication that anyone could love what seemed to him an unrighteous peace, do not settle the issue whether or not Dr. Van Dyke has preached bitterness and hate. His letter seems to me to settle that issue. He has, however, now raised another issue by accusing me of "deliberately" misrepresenting him. His letter to you seems to me to settle also this issue, for in this letter he says: "I have not the honor of Mr. Moors's acquaintance." How then can he know my mental and moral processes? I do know them and answer his accusation with authority and emphatically in the negative.

Boston, June 14 JOHN F. MOORS

Still True

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I read last night for perhaps the hundredth time James Russell Lowell's address on "Democracy," delivered in Birmingham, England, October 6, 1884. In my view its republication in the columns of the *Nation* at this time would have a stabilizing effect on the minds of your readers. It reads as if it were delivered yesterday with the present day situation in mind. I give you three quotations from it, thinking they will create a thirst for the entire address:

"To the door of every generation there comes a knocking, and unless the household, like the Thane of Cawdor and his wife, have been doing some deed without a name, they need not shudder. It turns out at worst to be a poor relation who wishes to come in out of the cold. The porter always grumbles and is slow to open—'Who's there, in the name of Beelzebub?' he mutters. Not a change for the better in our human housekeeping has ever taken place that wise and good men have not opposed it—have not prophesied with the alderman that the world would wake up to find its throat cut in consequence of it. The world, on the contrary, wakes up, rubs its eyes, yawns, stretches itself, and goes about its business as if nothing had happened. . . .

"No, amid all the fruitless turmoil and miscarriage of the world, if there be one thing steadfast and of favorable omen, one thing to make optimism distrust its own obscure distrust, it is the rooted instinct in men to admire what is better and more beautiful than themselves. The touchstone of political and social institutions is their ability to supply them with worthy objects of this sentiment, which is the very taproot of civilization and progress. There would seem to be no readier way of feeding it with the elements of growth and vigor than such an organization of society as will enable men to respect themselves, and so to justify them in respecting others. . . .

"I have grown to manhood and am now growing old with the growth of this system of government in my native land, have watched its advances or what some would call its encroachments, gradual and irresistible as those of a glacier, have been an ear-witness to the forebodings of wise and good and timid men and have lived to see those forebodings belied by the course of events, which is apt to show itself humorously careless of the reputation of prophets."

New York, June 14 A. A. DREW

Dubious Sportsmanship

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Some newspaper comment sees in the protest of the German delegation against the terms of the peace treaty, a lack of sportsmanship. According to this, it is sportsmanlike to kick your opponent when he is down, but unsportsmanlike on his part to protest against such chivalrous treatment. This seems a novel interpretation of sportsmanship.

Bryan, Texas, June 17 S. LOMANITZ

Irate Italy

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just received an interesting letter from an Italian friend, parts of which I should be glad to share with readers of the *Nation*.

White Plains, N. Y., June 10 VISOR

"I cannot pass under silence the events of these last days which have set all Italy vibrating with passion and offended dignity. The proceedings of President Wilson pass all comprehension. He has a right to his ideas, like everybody else, and if he thinks Fiume ought not to be ours, he may say so, but not make it a point which imperilled, as it did, the whole work of the stunted Peace Conference. It is the way he expressed his views that was an insult to all of us. It is with very bitter feelings that we see how our Allies, France and England, for whom no blandishment was enough when they wanted our help, for whom Italy appeared as a saviour from a very tight corner, now put us down and leave us alone to fight for our rights—simply out of deference for your President, who knows as much about our history and that of Fiume as I know about the language and history of the Redskins.

"Fiume itself long before Austria was defeated solemnly declared its Italianity and seceded from Hungary. And now Wilson says we must not listen to her. Why? On account of his famous Fourteen Points, not one of which he has not violated when it suited him to do so. He claims America's right to interfere in Europe, but prevents Europe from interfering with America, thanks to the Monroe Doctrine. No, Wilson has fallen from his pedestal. It has been a cold-blooded defection, first from his principles, in favor of the Jugoslavs, and then in favor of France and England. For us who put our trust in him as in a just man, the reaction is too strong."

"Genoa, Italy, April 30 CAV. ROBERTO PESCIO"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIBRARY BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE BEREA, OHIO

Captor and Captive

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial, "The Higher Law," on the subject of the imprisonment of Debs, is both eloquent and courageous. Liberal thought owes you a debt of gratitude for it. So questionable was the constitutionality of the Espionage Act that liberals were inclined to believe it could not command the assent of the President. The legal limit of ten days had in fact almost elapsed before Mr. Wilson placed his signature to a bill worse than that which had wrecked the old Federalist party.

Had the law operated only against a few obscure individuals, the prisons would have swallowed them with hardly a ripple on the surface of our busy life. But when a giant, like Debs, throws down the gauntlet to a law which he believes more honored in the breach than in the observance, when a man beloved by multitudes goes proudly to jail, the captor becomes the captive.

There is reason to believe that the Administration realizes already that it has caught a Tartar. Mr. Tumulty's reported cable to the President, and Mr. Wilson's cable to the Attorney General, confirm this suspicion. But the Administration finds it difficult to let go of Debs without at the same time parting with its dignity. Debs personally has not asked for a pardon. While floods of letters pour into Washington, demanding full pardon for Debs, the Administration not only does not know how to let go of so determined a prisoner, but is confronted with Debs's calm declaration that they shall not let go of him unless they virtually confess that the law under which he is held is infamous, by releasing all its victims.

Clinton, Iowa, June 15 C. A. MOSELEY

Sursum Corda

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: With a flash of black eyes a lad who had lost both legs at Château-Thierry exclaimed, "I would give a thousand dollars if I could only go to one more dance!" They are singularly old, these soldier lads of ours, and wise with the wisdom of those who have faced danger and sacrifice; and yet some of them seem to have come out of the experience as young as newborn children, with a simplicity and childlikeness that is often amazing.

"I wish people wouldn't be *kind* to us," said this boy. "When I was in the hospital in France, I could do some things for a boy who did not have an arm and he would use his legs to do other things for me. We were just comrades, and that's the way we want people to treat us over here. We don't want people to try to be kind to us, we want them to be comrades." There was keenness in the strong young face, and vigor in the broad shoulders and straight back, but the awful space in the wheelchair, which the afghan covered, indicated that there would never again be swift stridings through working days or gay trampings through holidays. Yet, had not this youth brought back with him the last, most precious gift of civilization, the secret of democracy?

I looked up just then from my desk in the Red Cross House at the unusual sound. Five or six young soldiers were going through the motions of dancing, putting one foot forward delicately, following it with the other, and very slowly turning round. Their motions were awkward and uncertain, but their faces were bright with an eager light, the light one sees in a young child when first he achieves success on roller or ice skates. They were very merry over their difficulties, and peals of gay laughter greeted some special success, but on the whole, things did not go well with them. I watched them with a sudden tightening of the throat. They were trying out their new wooden legs.

Washington, D. C., June 13 CLARA W. HERBERT

The High Cost of Liberty

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: While everyone knows that prices are very high nowadays, people do not stop to recollect that the cost of liberty, like everything else, has also gone up. Consequently it takes money to run our Government in these days. In addition, for example, to paying the salary of Postmaster Burleson and Solicitor Lamar, we have to feed, clothe, and pay a peace army of more than 940,000 men in Europe. Of course there are also some 1,500 conscientious objectors, socialists, and I. W. W.'s in our various camps, jails, and prisons—Debs, Haywood, Baldwin and the rest—all willing and able enough to support themselves, for whom the Government must not only buy food, clothing and shelter, but for whom it must hire a host of attendants.

Deportations, too, help to empty the treasury. Boarding men for months, paying doctors' bills, and funeral expenses of those who can't stand prison treatment, and Red Specials across a continent, cost money.

No wonder we need a soda tax!

Boston, June 11 H. C. W.

Self-Government for India

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Would you kindly reprint the following call to Englishmen by the leaders of the British Labour Party, which appeared in the *Daily Herald* of April 24.

New York, June 16 SAILENDRA NATH GHOSE

"We, the undersigned, appeal to our fellow countrymen and women to give thought and attention to the condition of affairs in India. That country, which contains 315 millions of human beings, is at present ruled by a handful of officials whose gross incompetence and ignorance have brought these peaceful, law-abiding people to the verge of open, undisguised revolution.

"Indians ask the same rights, the same duties, the same recognition as Siberia, Poland, and other small European peoples. The bureaucrats of India reply with a Coercion Act which robs Indians of all freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of public meeting.

"Indians are unarmed, yet they are bombed from aeroplanes and shot down with machine guns.

"We cannot believe our countrymen and women understand these things, neither do we think they realize that these autocratic methods place in jeopardy the lives of thousands of British men, women, and children.

"We therefore ask you to join us in our protest against the bombing and shooting of unarmed men and women, and in our demand for a public inquiry into these outrages, the complete withdrawal of the Coercion Bills, and the immediate introduction of self-government, giving to the millions of Indians the same rights as now enjoyed by Canada, Australia, and Africa.

"ROBERT WILLIAMS
"ROBERT SMILLIE
"GEORGE LANSBURY"

Contributors to this Issue

J. P. CHAMBERLAIN is secretary of the Legislative Drafting Fund in Columbia University.

NORMAN ANGELL, the well-known British journalist, author of "The Great Illusion" and other important books on international relations, is at present observing the work of the Peace Conference.

NORMAN FOERSTER, associate professor of English in the University of North Carolina, is the author of numerous books and articles in the field of English literature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

The Larger Altruism

Altruism, Its Nature and Varieties. By George Herbert Palmer. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

A BOOK of few pages and of many thoughts is Professor Palmer's "Altruism." It is packed with a kind of wisdom that is to be found only when a keen and well-trained intellect is combined with length of years and noble living, and it is expressed in that classic English which Mr. Palmer's readers long ago learned to associate with his name. The educated public of America may be divided into two classes, both large: those who have studied under Mr. Palmer and those who have not. To both groups this book will be a joy. To the latter class it will bring many a new idea; while Mr. Palmer's former students will catch in every sentence the ring of that voice which they learned to love years ago in the old "Philosophy 4." To them indeed the book will offer no new point of view. Some of it, in fact, they may find in their own dust-covered student note-books; a little of it is taken almost word for word from the author's "Nature of Goodness," published sixteen years ago. Yet though the fundamental idea of the book is that expounded so persuasively and for so many years at Harvard, the method of approach is new, and an application of it is made to certain aspects of human life upon which Mr. Palmer had not touched before.

The fundamental idea to which reference has just been made is a conception of the self which, once grasped, makes both egoism and altruism in their narrow sense false abstractions. To conceive of the self as isolated and quite independent is wrong in both logic and ethics. The only conception ultimately tenable is that of the "conjunct self," which includes its relations to its environment and with them an indefinitely great mass of interests and purposes which are social in their nature and are shared with many others. The recognition of this conjunct self, i.e., a truly enlightened "altruism," may be traced in several ascending stages, and it is to a consideration of these that the volume is devoted. For the first of these stages Mr. Palmer uses the word "Manners," by which he means "such a voluntary conformity to a code of conduct as, within a fixed field of intercourse, insures to each person the least offense and a due opportunity of self-expression." Here, plainly, there is at least the beginning of a recognition of the interests of others and a certain amount of good will, but the abstract self and the alter are still sharply distinguished. A closer approach to the ideal is found in "Gifts," in which the ego is truly denied for the sake of the others. Lack of space forbids us to dwell upon the ripe wisdom with which the whole matter of giving and receiving is handled; instead we must hurry on to the third stage of Altruism, namely "Mutuality," in which the chief defect of giving is avoided. This chief defect is the retention of the old contrast between the ego and the alter as being essentially different beings. Mutuality is "the recognition of another and myself as inseparable elements of one another, each being essential to the welfare of each." Examples of this are to be found in partnerships, or in almost any honest business transaction where both seller and purchaser profit. The defect of mere Mutuality is to be found in its very limited scope. It is only in a single transaction or for a single purpose that the two partners sink their separateness and unite their lives. Complete union, or something approximating it, is to be found only in Love, which is "the joint service of a common life."

Yet Love also has its limitations. It reaches the goal of complete rationality only when it refuses to confine itself to one individual and stretches out, instead, to all the race. When Love has undergone this fulfilling transformation we call it no longer Love but Justice. Justice to Mr. Palmer, as to Plato, is thus the supreme virtue, the sum of all the virtues. It includes not only benevolence but such things as the sense of professional responsibility, the service of institutions, and all the impersonal loyalties. It is, in short, "the impartial love of our fellow-men. When we are commanded to love our neighbor as ourself, we cannot excuse ourselves by saying that love does not move by command but takes its own way according to individual temperament. Even of the simpler forms of love this is only partially true; wisdom, purpose, and patience being also essentials of permanence even in our private loves. But that public love to which we are summoned is no mere emotion, arising blindly and passing with the mood. It is the rational acceptance of our place in a social organization where all are dependent on each."

Such is the argument of the book. But its chief value for many a reader will be found in the incidental insights, the treasures gathered through a long life of observation and reflection, which are scattered all along the way. Mr. Palmer has the rare power of bringing the science of ethics very close to the art of living.

The Future of the College

The Colleges in War Time and After. By Parke Rexford Kolbe. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

WHAT the war has done for the college is almost as problematical as what it has done for the church. What the college has done for the war is, however, less doubtful; and President Kolbe, of the Municipal University of Akron, has given us an admirably clear record of its activities. The major portion of the book is devoted to an account of the various attempts on the part of the Government and the colleges to coördinate their efforts in the light of the growing conviction on both sides "that a continued supply of college-trained men was essential for combat with a foe whose technical achievements had played so great a *rôle* in the warfare of the past four years." There are chapters on the first unorganized efforts of the college to mobilize their resources; the work of the Government committees, especially the War Department's Committee on Education and Special Training; the ill-fated Students' Army Training Corps, of which Dr. Kolbe thinks better than it deserves; the magnificent aid brought to the Government by the technical schools and departments; the effect of the war upon the college curriculum and upon college life generally; the personal contribution of college people, both men and women, to the war; and the effect of the war upon college finances. There are, besides, two introductory chapters on the outlook for higher education in 1917 and a concluding chapter on the outlook for it now. Naturally, and we think correctly, Dr. Kolbe attributes the important service rendered to the Government by the colleges to the gradual changes in their temper due to the economic history of the past fifty years. These are, in particular, their awakened sense of social responsibility and the increasing adjustment of their courses to the practical needs of their constituents. Naturally also, though we hope less correctly, Dr. Kolbe assumes that the future of higher education in this country will be largely determined by the unprecedented experiences of the past two years. For example, speaking of the vocational units that were established in more than one hundred and fifty institutions, he remarks that their influence is sure to be profound, "because our proudest colleges have in this emergency undertaken a work not strictly collegiate and have, so to say, opened up a new channel of endeavor where formal entrance requirements play no *rôle* and only quick results count." More than once he assures us that "the principle of training intensively for a definite purpose has come to stay." That it has come to stay in the ordinary colleges of liberal arts we doubt, though we grant that it will influence them profoundly unless the believers in an older and better tradition are more vigilant and effective than they have sometimes been. Moreover, we are less clear than Dr. Kolbe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the desirability of a national Department of Education. The very ground upon which he bases his belief in it is the cause of our misgiving: "While many may hesitate at the possible relinquishment of entire individual autonomy, the war has taught as its greatest lesson the value of a certain degree of centralized governmental control—a doctrine which the past two years have developed to unthought-of proportions in our country." If the recent experiences of the colleges are a foretaste of the kind of "standardizing" and "unifying" that may be expected from a national Department, the war will indeed prove to have been an educational calamity. Mechanical methods, the loss of individual initiative, the clamor for "quick results," and the discrediting of subjects that are merely "cultural" in value are, we suspect, the inevitable outcome of such centralization. Dr. Kolbe perceives that it will not do for the colleges merely to yield to the pressure of contemporary opinion.

Notwithstanding these wise utterances, we think Dr. Kolbe is too ready to assume that higher education is about to undergo a radical change in consequence of the war. If the war had lasted longer, there would have been more ground for such a view. We rather suspect that its chief effect will be to furnish an unparalleled opportunity to innovators, who will seize the chance to try their favorite experiments on the unfortunate colleges and to attribute the changes resulting therefrom to economic necessity. To this great first cause of all modern social phenomena Dr. Kolbe attaches, we think, undue importance. He regards it indeed as "our only safe guide in determining the future." To this doctrine of "manifest destiny," whether in politics or in education, we cannot subscribe. On the contrary, we believe it to be one of the functions of the higher education to thwart so-called "inevitable" tendencies. It is inconceivable that men and women of light and leading should have no positive influence on the direction of progress; that they should always follow and never lead. The truth is that, in much current reasoning on educational matters, the idea of democracy has been allowed to penetrate from the social and political sphere, where it belongs, to the intellectual sphere, where it does not belong, and we hesitate to attack it there for fear of seeming to attack it on its own ground. "Higher education" has come to mean, in many quarters, "education as high as the average person who must earn his living by it will stand." But if this definition is to become universal, what agency will be left to produce the intellectual leaders which even a democracy cannot do without, as this war has abundantly proved? The colleges are the sole custodians of certain immaterial forces that are essential to the highest civilization; of these forces, the type of education that is conditioned wholly or chiefly by economic necessity does not even touch the fringe. We do not mean to imply that Dr. Kolbe subscribes to the inadequate definition of education above mentioned; but he nowhere distinctly says that the true value of the higher education resides in the silent, imponderable influence that it brings to bear, at all times and seasons, upon the mind of the age.

That influence we do not believe it will relinquish in favor of any sort of "quick results," whatever the pressure of economic conditions. If it is the vice of the old-fashioned educator to deny that the world moves and therefore to refuse to contemplate the possibility of any radical change, it is the vice of the newer type to look not far enough into the future and to assume that his horizon is the end of the world. It is only fair to say that many of these pages were written in the immediate presence of the events which they describe. They would perhaps have been otherwise expressed if those events had been seen in perspective against a background of peace—if peace it can be called. Chaos is a better name for it, and what sort of cosmos will be the issue it is impossible to foretell. There be many spirits moving upon the face of the waters, and they are not all spirits of light. Nevertheless, we share Dr. Kolbe's conviction that "the college, whatever its detractors may say, has proved its value in the time of trial, and it may justly look forward to growth and honor in the land which it has helped to make and save."

"America First"

Democracy: Discipline: Peace. By William Roscoe Thayer. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

THE high reputation of the author of the "Life and Times of Cavour" and the "Life and Letters of John Hay" will certainly not be augmented by his Colver Lectures in Brown University. They are slight, rambling, repetitious, and confused. To summarize the thought is something of an undertaking. The first lecture asserts, as if we were still in the nineteenth century, that "the master word of Democracy is Individuality." Democracy demands the individual's highest development; and the individual's highest development demands freedom. Democracy may thus be regarded as a step in the secular movement toward freedom. But in the second lecture it turns out that the individual, far from being the centre of things, must work "with and for Society, towards collective, higher ends. That is Discipline." In the same lecture Discipline is defined as Education—not the shabby little red schoolhouse of our inefficient democracy, but a system as rigidly thoroughgoing as that of the old Jesuits and the modern Prussians, developing, however, not abject machines, but free moral agents. An elevated, not a mechanical, efficiency—this is promising; but the reader suffers disillusionment when Mr. Thayer goes on to sketch the foundations of the new education, viz., a knowledge of English composition, a knowledge of American history soundly interpreted, and universal military training. The last of these is necessary because every citizen must be ready to defend his country (not, we presume, by attacking another), because he needs discipline (yes, but not necessarily this discipline), and because he will acquire military carriage (something of an anticlimax). "Adequate provision for defence" is of course the big thing. Finally, in the third lecture, entitled "Peace" but actually about Americanization, the author insists upon the Americanization of the foreign-born as the prerequisite of domestic concord. "The motto—'America First'—should not only be on every one's lips, but in every one's heart, the rule of conduct for every one's life." The book ends with the usual fatuous optimism of the "patriotic" American. Many are the false civilizations, we are told, that have had their day and perished—Chinese, Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, Roman, Venetian, Saracen, Ottoman, Muscovite, mediæval German. "At last, behold a new dawn, and the vanguard of the American Republic rises above the horizon. Here is the promise for which the ages have waited; here the culmination which Fate has slowly prepared."

This is all very nice, normal, commonplace, inspiring—that is, if one can accept it. Most of us are worried about America. Nothing is more certain than that we do need democracy, discipline, and peace; nothing is more certain than that they are not to be finally achieved by the old individualism and nationalism adequately armed for defence. New ideals of democracy and peace are springing up, to which the visible future belongs. New ideals of discipline will follow in their wake—new and yet old, for true discipline is single in all the ages.

"Discipline—Discipline! That is our tragic need. Only through Discipline comes Freedom." It is truly said. "The European Anarchy," as G. Lowes Dickinson termed the "order" of things out of which the war issued, was a world anarchy, and the world anarchy was the anarchy of the nineteenth century individual writ large. As the war was its fruit, so are the after-pangs of today its fruit. If this anarchy of the individual is not resolved into harmony, there will be varied pangs in unending succession. Curiously enough, Mr. Thayer, in his confused meditations and fulminations, has a vision of the nature of this harmony based on discipline: "The really free man is he who, understanding the master laws of life, works with them so harmoniously that he has indeed behind him, not only the physical forces that move the sun and stars, but the Moral Law

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that has chosen humanity as the instrument through which to reveal itself on earth." And this goes to the heart of the matter: hard is the need, he says, of discipline, "the training which gives swiftness and strength to the runner and sureness of aim to the marksman; the self-restraint which brings self-mastery; the knowledge and obedience which enable man to make the forces of nature work for him; the devotion to spiritual laws which lifts his soul to its full stature and makes him a citizen of the Eternal. Democracy implies Discipline. What Dante said of the Blessed in Heaven is equally true of us on earth:

E la sua volontate è nostra pace.
(And the Divine Will is our peace.)"

Faith and discipline seem terribly far away at this moment, but it is certain that none of our achievements will last if they are built only on the shifting sands of sentiment, impulse, efficiency, and "idealism." Mr. Thayer would do well to give emphasis, not to his hatred of autocracy and socialism (forces making "drives" against civilization), and to his love of America, Americanization, American history properly taught, and military training for all Americans, but to his vision of the guidance of the Eternal in all men. Not "America First" as the "rule of conduct," but Humanity First or God First.

Fellow Mortals

A History of Everyday Things in England. Written and illustrated by Marjorie and C. H. B. Quennell. Part I, 1066-1499. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

In the Days of the Guild. By L. Lamprey. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company.

WITH kings and queens stepping down from their thrones, we may venture to draw aside the arras of history and claim acquaintance with the everyday people in the background —those who made the world which we have been taught to know chiefly by reigns and wars. Colleges and schools are throwing out the old history courses; it remains to be seen what will be shaped instead. Some writers still see the past only by the baleful light kindled by flames of the great war; some have inherited an intellectual feudalism that would entrench itself behind the defences of Americanization; some would cut wholly adrift from the old, and would people strange islands with their new beliefs. And while schools debate methods our children are growing up. Therefore, we have especial cause to cherish two recent books, written for English school children, but of equal value to children and adults in this country.

From old chronicles, records, illuminated manuscripts, prints, brasses, and carvings, Mr. and Mrs. Quennell have deftly constructed a living picture of English everyday life, century by century, from 1066 to 1499. By a simple process of selection each century is made to stand out vividly and invite comparison with its successors. For instance, after a brief account of the general conditions of England at the opening of the century, the characteristic costumes of the time, of both high and low degree, are shown. Then follow the ships, the castles, the dwellings, the great halls, and monasteries. Windmills, looms, and carts, tools and toys, give homely touches to the picture. Under each of the clever drawings are references to the other chapters, so that the development of domestic architecture or the evolution of the sailing ship may be easily traced, while costume moves apace with architecture. To fix the relation of all these elements a chart is provided for each century, giving the dates of the kings and queens of England and France, the famous men, great events, sea fights, land battles, and the principal buildings, grouped according to the period of design.

It is easy to see that this book was planned by an architect, and that it is carried out by husband and wife with an unusual degree of intermarriage of the arts; the architectural designs are always drawn by Mr. Quennell, and the human figures, in the same illustration, by his wife. One feels the same happy unison in the text. It is doubtful if any handbook has made so clear the development of architecture, from the sturdy barrel vault to the fairylike fan vault. The reasons for this elaboration and the steps by which it was attained are told in a way to fascinate a child. The whole book affords much the same pleasure that one used to have in studying the celebrated doll houses in Nuremberg, and in the Ryks Museum, where every detail of mediæval family life was reproduced in the furnishings and utensils, and even the dolls did their part to set history forth in miniature.

The Quennells have not only imparted information and peopled the past with persons like ourselves, but have linked past and present in a stimulating fashion. The boy who makes a companion of this book will take a more intelligent interest in the houses building around him. Knowing something of how and why the old buildings were designed, he will see the folly of mere imitation, and yet will have had his attention drawn to the beauty of design, and the fitness and excellence of structure. He will be inspired to turn to the old documents of the past, whether penned or fashioned in stone, to feel anew his kinship with those who carried on the work of the world—while kings made "history."

The joy of the worker and the devotion of the craftsman, emphasized by the Quennells, are carried much further by Miss Lamprey in her stories of the guilds. The scribe, the glassworker, the goosegirl, the goldsmith, the shepherd and the woolmerchant, the troubadour, the woodcarver, the shoemaker, the baker's boy—all make a kindly fellowship. But these narratives are not mere stories, though told in readable fashion. The plan in the main is to chronicle the days of a guild worker, beginning with his early dreams as an apprentice; following him step by step as he learns his calling, and sharing his pleasures of achievement. With unusual skill Miss Lamprey makes real the processes of each craft, the daily life of the craftsman, and his part in the community life. The joy of creative work, the satisfaction of simplicity, and man's dependence on beauty are set forth with charming freshness. Such a book will be eagerly read by those who are awaking to the drabness of the workers' stereotyped, machine-made lives.

Snapshots of British Notables

Uncensored Celebrities. By E. T. Raymond. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

THROWN into bold relief by the glare of the world-conflagration, certain prominent figures in English public life have been deftly caught by the camera dexterously manipulated by Mr. E. T. Raymond; and the hastily developed portraits, first put to newspaper use, are now assembled in a handy album bearing the curiosity-awakening title, "Uncensored Celebrities." In other words, we have here a collection of brief sketches, in lively journalistic style, of thirty-three men and one woman (Mrs. Sidney Webb) whose talents have not been allowed to hide themselves in a napkin during the difficult and searching days of the war.

First, almost as a matter of course, comes Lloyd George, short and stocky and sturdy of build, of quick and vigorous rather than capacious or subtle intellect. Next follows Sir Edward Carson, tall and gaunt and hatchet-faced, black, aloof, and sinister, yawning "with the easy but terrifying grace of one of the higher carnivora." Then we meet with Mr. Asquith, distinguished survival of the Victorian age, puritanic in some of his ways, but none the less a lover of the theatre and cards and the chatter of attractive women. After him there pass in rapid review the Earl of Derby, Viscount Grey, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Balfour, Reginald McKenna, Winston Churchill, General Smuts, Arthur Henderson, Northcliffe, Curzon, Haldane, Auckland Geddes, and others no less interesting to the reader as viewed through Mr. Raymond's shrewdly observant eyes. But whether we are made acquainted with the real man in each

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instance, and not with some humorous or satirical or otherwise arresting caricature, we find ourselves asking more than once, with a lurking suspicion that the sketches are a bit too clever to be strictly accurate. They are too good to be true, like so many other things in the realm of fancy. Admirably skilful in the use of epigram and paradox, of allusion and antithesis, of image and metaphor, the author is tempted to let his rhetorical facility get undue control of his pen, to the undeniable contentment of the reader for pleasure, but to the distrust of the searcher for truth. We have, in colloquial phrase, a rattling good story. It is all, indeed, a brilliant piece of work of its kind, but it is not history.

As illustrating the writer's predilection for neat and effective rhetorical devices, a few brief passages offer themselves for quotation. Antithesis and paradox are compactly welded in such sentences as "Englishmen might pardon Lord Haldane's defects, but they could hardly forgive his virtues." Mr. Balfour is picturesquely described as holding that "the democratic flood would not fructify the deserts, but only obliterate the oases. There is not enough culture to go round; why lose what we have in a vain attempt to give everyone a share?" Viscount Grey is to the Germans "prince and chief of liars. He stands on a lonely pinnacle. His home is in the higher Alps of mendacity, far above the line of stunted truth and the edelweiss of small deceit, in the region of eternal f !sity." Occasionally the antithetical balance so dear to Macaulay is preserved in form merely, not in the thought, as where it is said of Mr. Asquith that "his language, though precise, is guarded"—as if precision were not of the very essence of carefully controlled phraseology.

The author is betrayed into inconsistency by an overfondness for developing and elaborating the idea of the moment without reference to what has preceded or is to follow. Thus we are told that Asquith had a certain soft-heartedness as "shown in his incapacity to understand the real Prussia," and later that he possessed "the lawyer's horror of Prussian lawlessness that moved the man so tremendously as to give his earlier war speeches the moral fervor of a crusade." Again, we read that he "belongs distinctly to the Victorians" and, two pages further on, that his "style of speaking, though of great merit, was somewhat too bare and bloodless to delight a generation accustomed to the Victorian grand manner." In a passage describing Lord Northcliffe's gift of intuitive perception, the thought is unnecessarily muddled. It is stated that "he knows exactly what the public wants, or rather what the public would want if it knew how to make its wants known." But it is in just this helpless inarticulateness that Northcliffe finds his opportunity; also, the wants referred to are obviously independent of any ability or inability to make them known.

The "saving touch of indolence" Mr. Raymond finds in some characters, as in Grey and Geddes, despite their notable sum of achievement. In one passage he attributes to Talleyrand an utterance of Comte d'Argenson, and incidentally misquotes the utterance, tripping up a little on the French idiom. On another page he gives inaccurately Dr. Johnson's famous remark concerning women preachers. He might, if unable or unwilling to verify his text, at least have refrained from using quotation marks. Elsewhere, again, he thinks to turn to good account the "gold-rimmed spectacles" bought by the guileless Moses Primrose, and the moral is painstakingly driven home that all that glisters is not gold. But, unfortunately, the famous green spectacles in question are described by Goldsmith as rimmed with silver, not with gold.

Revision of these highly enjoyable character sketches before republication in book form would have been advisable. But no revision is needed of their general sanity and their larger truth, their outspoken opposition to the evil philosophy of Germany's late rulers, their plea for a Wilsonian rather than a Lansdowne policy as the more promising means "by which the common sense and instinctive morality of the common man shall triumph over the follies of the wise and the sordid ambitions of the great."

Books in Brief

IT is a pleasure to find a scholar who has so well profited by criticism as has Mr. Hartley Bateson in his second edition of "Patience: A West Midland Poem of the Fourteenth Century" (Longmans, Green). The work, "recast and partly rewritten" as the author states, has gained much in solidity. A highly hypothetical and rather sentimental sketch of the poet has been deleted, the glossary has been revised, the bibliography brought up to date, and the notes enriched and improved both by suppression and addition. Examples of interesting new matter may be found—for instance, in notes on lines 92 and 101, and in the technical expressions about the ship (lines 122, 185, 259, 385). Mr. Bateson, after weighing all criticisms, retains his earlier opinion concerning the order of the poet's works; contrary to the more usual theory of older scholars, he places the great imaginative poems, "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight" and "The Pearl," at the end of the series, and opens that series with "Patience." He argues his case well, though it remains a strain on the sense of probability to accept the sequence from homiletical writing to the free power of "Gawain" and "The Pearl." No one, however, can read "Patience," despite its didactic intent, without realizing that he holds commerce with a poet. The quaintness which delights the modern reader of this mediæval Jonah-story is an accidental asset; but there is permanent literary quality in the characteristic English treatment of ship and sea and storm, in the grim realism of Jonah in the fish's belly, and in the religious passion of his prayers from that darksome and malodorous spot. No one can help sharing his joy in his "gay logge" of "wod-bynde." Whether the woodbine which the Lord sent with the dawning day was ivy or convolvulus does not matter; we know how Jonah felt when he looked "on the grene graciouse leves, That ever waved a wynde so wyth [gentle] and so cole." The English or Celtic delicacy of nature-feeling, the English religious sense, give the poem charm and power. It has more than linguistic interest, and we hope that Mr. Bateson's new edition will do much to keep it alive beside its more obviously attractive companions.

THE monograph on "The Taxation of Mines in Montana" (Huebsch), by Louis Levine, is interesting to the general reader because of the circumstances which gave publicity to it rather than because of the character of the essay itself, which is somewhat severely technical. Not long ago the fact came out in the newspapers, and was made the subject of editorial comment in widely-read journals, that a professor had been suspended from the faculty of the University of Montana because he had persisted in the publication of an essay on taxation which the university authorities found distasteful to themselves and to powerful personages whose favor it was necessary for them to curry. If Professor Levine had been left undisturbed in his work his essay would probably have been read only by a small circle of students and other specialists; and notwithstanding its very considerable value, it would probably have taken but slight hold on the imagination of even these readers. As it is, the essay is being widely read throughout the country by those who wish to know how serious an offence a scholar must commit to be suspended from an American university. The university authorities have done Mr. Levine a great service through giving extended publicity to his independence and careful scholarships; and they have greatly added to the number of those who know and condemn the disgraceful inequity which characterizes the Montana tax system. The essay is a dispassionate and objective presentation of information bearing on the taxation of mines, and of the elementary and generally undisputed economic principles which relate to this information. The problem is in large measure stated in the words of Governors and other public officials representing different political parties. Statistical information is presented showing, for example, that one mining company paid in 1916 less than five per cent. on its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

income, while other corporations paid from thirteen to fifteen per cent. That the Constitution be amended in order that mining property may be placed on an equal basis for taxation with other forms of property is one of the practical suggestions growing out of Mr. Levine's study. In a day when large numbers of thoughtful people are ready to ask for the nationalization of minerals and other such gifts of nature, this seems to be a moderate proposal.

FRANCE and her future is the timely theme of Victor Cambon's book, "Où allons-nous?" (Paris: Payot). The author, who has written extensively on social and industrial questions, goes to the roots of his subject, as he did in "L'Allemagne au Travail" (1909), "La France au Travail" (1912), and "Notre Avenir" (1916). In the present volume, a sequel to "Notre Avenir," he aims to show that without radical reforms in hygiene, economic equipment, and business methods, and patriotic cooperation in place of social antagonism, France cannot remain a great Power. After outlining the economic readjustments necessitated by the war, M. Cambon suggests solutions for the problems that France must immediately solve. He says in substance: "First, in applying the lessons of the war, we must check tuberculosis by removing the cause: intemperance. To reduce further our alarming mortality, we must build hygienic houses, insist on physical education, and make public health our constant concern. Scarcely less vital is our economic life. We must renew our entire industrial equipment. Let us also put our navy and our merchant marine on a rational basis. The distressing condition of our waterways and harbors grieves every French patriot. And why should France's hydraulic power remain undeveloped? Again, agriculture, mining, forestry, manufacturing, demand modern methods. Routine, favoritism, the cult of incompetence, must go. And may French workmen remember what German workmen have shown us: that the employer's interests are their own. Unscrupulous agitators have had their day. Nor can our intellectual classes afford to continue their unpatriotic indifference to political and economic life. Their initiative is the more necessary since the State has failed lamentably in all industrial undertakings." While certain of M. Cambon's views seem exaggerated, he impresses his reader as an economist of broad and steady vision. He is not an alarmist, but rather a patriot anxious about his country's future. His criticisms, though fearless and at times severe—for instance, in denouncing the "bistro" (saloon-keeper), demagogues, bureaucracy, and the frivolity of the press—are without animosity. What depresses him most at present is the conviction that, despite the heroism of her "poilus," her sacrifices in human lives, and the ruins of her devastated territory, France is not taking measures, social, political, or economic, that will enable her to recuperate without assistance. If, as M. Cambon implies, the French really do not know "whither they are bound," his book should assist them in finding their bearings.

THE amount of water which has passed under the bridge since the armistice was signed and the peace conference convened is seen in "American Labor and the War" (Doran), a volume of speeches by Mr. Samuel Gompers. Most of them were delivered as extemporaneous addresses at meetings of the American Federation of Labor, various labor conferences, and at war meetings. Three of the addresses were given abroad—one of them in London, one in Paris, and a third in Italy. As in many other war books, the significant fact is the absence of any real grasp of what should be done after the war was ended. Serious discussions of the real problems of peace and criticism of policies were lacking in the United States through a mistaken notion of patriotism. The present volume is no exception to this rule, for the substance of some of the addresses is made up of the exaltation of democracy, without any definition of what is meant by the term, and indiscriminate laudation of President Wilson. Many of the arguments advanced are subject to serious question. The claim that the American Federation is interested in the welfare of the unskilled worker is hardly borne out by facts. The recent strike at Lawrence, for instance showed that only an insignificant minority of the workmen were organized along Federation lines and that this minority was made up of only the more highly skilled and better paid workmen. Then again, it is well to remember that a large number of American workmen are not organized at all.

WHEN questioned by a prospective employer, at the end of a ten years' sojourn in the United States, concerning his business experience, the autobiographical hero of Jean Farmer's "César-Napoléon Gaillard" (Paris: Payot) was able to enumerate sixteen more or less unpleasant occupations to which, at one time or another, an unkind fate had driven him. These ranged all the way from bottle-washing and strike-breaking to fancy dancing and playing the piano in a house of ill-fame. That he got the job he was seeking was not due to the length and complexity of his record, nor is it necessary now to say what it was due to. It is more to the point to state here that the adventures of this *Tartarin des villes* are numerous and varied, and that they are related with considerable humor, even if that humor is a little strained now and then.

Published Tomorrow

LEO TOLSTOY'S

The Pathway of Life

In Two Volumes

Translated by Archibald J. Wolfe

"The PATHWAY OF LIFE" is Tolstoy's posthumous message to a war-torn suffering world. It is the Gospel of right living and right thinking and offers the great philosopher's panacea against world wars and misery, helping mankind to eradicate all those false feelings, desires and doctrines, personal, social, economic and religious, which are responsible for the present plight of humanity.

International Book Publishing Co.

5 Beekman Street, New York

Price $2.00 each volume

MOLIERE

A Romantic Play

by

PHILIP MOELLER

Author of "Madame Sand," etc.

¶ "Splendidly and nobly written."—*Baltimore Eve. Sun.* "Quite the most important contribution to the American theatre this year; nothing of such high quality has come here from abroad."—*N. Y. Sun.*

$1.50 at all bookshops

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 W. Forty-second St., New York

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Chapman, R. W., editor. Selections from Boswell's Life of Johnson. Oxford Press. $1.60.

Croce, Benedetto. Goethe. Bari, Italy: Laterza & Figli.

Nitchie, Elizabeth. Vergil and the English Poets. Columbia Press. $1.50.

Scherillo, Michele. Della Letteratura Italiana. Vol. I, Le Origini. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Barker, Ernest. Ireland in the Last Fifty Years. Oxford Press.

Chekrezi, Constantine A. Albania Past and Present. Macmillan. $2.25.

MacIntyre, Niel. "Great-Heart": The Life Story of Theodore Roosevelt. New York: William E. Rudge.

Ollard, S. L., editor. A Forty Years' Friendship. London: Nisbet & Co.

Palgrave, R. H. Inglis, editor. Collected Historical Works of Sir Francis Palgrave. Cambridge: University Press.

Platnauer, Maurice. Life and Reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus. Oxford Press.

Smith, Vincent A. The Oxford History of India. Oxford Press. $6.25.

Wright, H. G. The Life and Works of Arthur Hall of Grantham. Longmans, Green. $3.75.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Doney, May. The Way of Wonder. Doran. $1.25.

Elliot, Ruth. Night Magic, and Other Poems. Boston: Stratford Co. $1.

Flagg, Isaac. Hylethen, and Other Poems. Boston: Stratford Co. $1.50.

Kemp, Harry. The Passing God. Brentano. $1.25.

MacCathmhaoil, Seosamh. The Mountainy Singer. Four Seas. $1.50.

Miller, Florette T. Hadassah. Boston: Stratford Co. $1.25.

Smith, C. Fox. Small Craft. Doran. $1.25.

Smith, C. Fox. Sailor Town. Doran. $1.25.

Thornely, Thomas. Verses from Fen and Fell. Cambridge: University Press.

FICTION

Byrd, John W. The Born Fool. Doran. $1.50.

Johnston, Sir Harry. The Gay-Dombeys. Macmillan. $1.75.

Merrick, Leonard. The Actor-Manager. Dutton. $2.

Turner, George K. Red Friday. Boston: Little, Brown. $1.40.

Wells, H. G. The Undying Fire. Macmillan. $1.50.

Williams, Ben A. All the Brothers were Valiant. Macmillan. $1.50.

THE WAR

Nevinson, Henry W. The Dardanelles Campaign. Holt. $5.

Nordhoff, Charles B. The Fledgling. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Abbott, Lyman. The Temple. Macmillan. $1.

Kirk, Harris E. The Consuming Fire. Macmillan. $1.50.

Schleiter, Frederick. Religion and Culture. Columbia Press. $2.

Tolstoy, Leo. The Pathway of Life. New York: International Book Company.

Wayland, John W. Christ as a Teacher. Boston: Stratford Company. $1.

EDUCATION

Dewey, Evelyn. New Schools for Old. Dutton. $2.

Slaught, H. E., and Lennes, N. J. Solid Geometry. Allyn & Bacon. $1.

Just Published

How To Face Peace

by

GERTRUDE SHELBY

How we may use the forces and organizations built up for the war to meet the varied problems of reconstruction. Gertrude Shelby writes out of a wide experience in community work and after being in close touch with the forces concerned. For ten months Mrs. Shelby was editor of the News Letter of the Women's Committee of the Council of National Defense, an exchange of community ideas for the 154,000 community councils. Her book furnishes a large number of actual reconstruction programs that aim at community betterment.

Constance D'Arcy Mackay's

Patriotic Drama in Your Town

Among other things, shows how Camp Dramatic Organizations may continue in Community Work. $1.35 net.

Henry Holt & Co. 19 W. 44th St. New York City

Have You

copies of The Nation for

January 3, 1918
January 4, 1919
January 11, 1919

?

We need these at once, and shall be glad to pay 10 cents for each copy

Address copies to the
Circulation Department
The Nation
20 Vesey Street, New York

A GENTLE CYNIC Being the Book of Ecclesiastes

By MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., Ph.D., LL.D. Author of "The War and the Bagdad Railway," etc. Small 4to. $2.00 net

A delightfully human book on the Omar Khayyam of the Bible with an exact translation of the original text. How it came to be written and who wrote it (and it was not Solomon), why additions were made to the original text and the whole interesting story is here given.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY - Philadelphia

Literary Agency

ALICE KAUSER

DRAMATISTS' AGENT—PLAYS

1402 Broadway, New York Established 1895

MOTION PICTURE DEPARTMENT

R. L. GIFFEN, Associate and Manager

For Independent Liberal and Labour Opinion in England read

COMMON SENSE

Edited by F. W. HIRST

Published every Saturday

Subscription rate $3.00 a year post paid. Subscriptions may be sent c/o The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City, or direct to the Manager, 44, Essex Street, London, W.C.2.

Send a card for a free specimen copy.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him and The Nation.

THE GREAT ALTERNATIVE:

Saner Politics or Revolution

By LEONARD J. REID, M.A. Crown 8vo. $2.25 net.

Discusses problems which business men and private citizens will have to face in the coming peace.

"Real, sane, considered, democratic progress—or Revolution, that is the great alternative. In the program of real liberalism the author discusses wealth; living conditions, and trade politics.—*Monthly Bulletin.*

There is here an exceptional amount of common sense, the one thing of which the world has the greatest need today.—*The Review.*

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

FOURTH AVENUE AND 30TH St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign and American Dealers in
Rare Books, Autographs, Manuscripts, Prints, Engravings, etc.

For Sale:
A Complete Set of the Publications
of the
KELMSCOTT PRESS
70 Volumes

Including the SAVONAROLA, the ANCOATS BROTHERHOOD LEAFLET, the 2 TRIAL PAGES from FROISSART, *and the following rare privately printed items, of which only 32 copies were done as mementoes for personal friends of William Morris in* 1896:—16 PAGES OF THE FROISSART, and 2 PAGES OF THE PROJECTED FOLIO EDITION OF SIGURD.

All in original bindings excepting Shakespeare's Poems (*red vellum*) and Chaucer (*half white tooled pigskin, oaken sides*).

The CHILD CHRISTOPHER *is printed on vellum.*

Price $4,500

HENRY SOTHERAN & CO.
43, Piccadilly, London, W., England

BOOKS.—All out-of-print books supplied, no matter on what subject. Write us. We can get you any book ever published. Please state wants. When in England call and see our 50,000 rare books. BAKER'S GREAT BOOKSHOP, 14-16 John Bright Street, Birmingham, England.

BOOKS, AUTOGRAPHS, PRINTS Catalogues Free
R. ATKINSON, 97 Sunderland Rd., Forest Hill, London, Eng

After an interval of two years spent in H. M. Home Forces Mr. Gorfin has resumed the issue of his Book Catalogues
AUTOGRAPHS BOOKS MANUSCRIPTS
Post free from HERBERT E. GORFIN, 1, Walerand Road Lewisham, London, S. E. 13

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW
$6.00 *per year* *English Edition* 75c *per copy*
LEONARD SCOTT PUB. CO., 249 W. 13th St., New York

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES TO BE HAD at ABRAHAM'S BOOK STORE, 145 4th Avenue

THE
MOSHER BOOKS CATALOGUE
It will be valued for itself alone. It also shows that I am still making beautiful books. Free on request.
Thomas Bird Mosher
PORTLAND, MAINE.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him and The Nation.

The Society of Free States
By Dwight W. Morrow.
An analysis of the proposed League of Nations. $1.25.
HARPER AND BROTHERS.
Established 1817. New York

WOMEN AND THE LABOUR PARTY
Indispensable to a comprehension of woman's place in the new social order. By the ten leading women of England. Introduction by Arthur Henderson.
(At good bookstores, 50c.)
Published by B. W. HUEBSCH *New York*

The Publishers Say:

"Nixola of Wall Street," by Felix Grendon, who should be known to readers of The Nation, is a love story of the business world with all the flavor and none of the fever of the Wall Street atmosphere. There is lots of fun in it and even more of sense.

N. P. D. (in the N. Y. Globe) Says:

"Shaw might have written the story in his younger days. . . . Clever, original and fundamentally serious. . . . It is a showing up of the whole Mumbo Jumbo of big business—Scientific Management, Efficiency, Executive Ability and all the rest. Mr. Grendon goes behind the impressive Delphic Voice and pulls out the little man. He snatches the wig off the Circus Wild Man from Borneo and shows him in the Bosom of his family. The Fourteen Points themselves have not been handled more profanely than Mr. Grendon handles the Twelve Points of Efficiency."

"Nixola of Wall Street" is published by The Century Co., 353 Fourth Avenue, New York City, and is sold at all bookstores for $1.50.

THE SUNWISE TURN, Inc.
2 East 31st Street, New York
We have ready several important volumes of critical literature.

The Dance of Siva By ANANDA COOMARASWAMY. Contains fourteen essays on phases of the creative will. $3.00

Rodin By RAINER MARIA RILKE. Is a finely wrought romantic critique. $1.50

The Intellectuals and the Wage Workers By HERBERT ELLSWORTH CORY. A pioneer attempt to define the relation to the present unrest of new knowledge in psychology, history, etc. $2.00

THE WONDERS OF THE HUMAN BODY
The days of speculative philosophy have ended. Recognizing, at last, the significance of the ancient command, "Man, know thyself," we demand facts. The wonders of the human organism and the actual chemical process of physical regeneration are facts, which are clearly and concisely set forth in this most marvelous book. *Price,* $1.50

THE CHEMISTRY OF HUMAN LIFE
A complete statement of the Chemistry of Life operating in the human organism.
The chemical formula of each of the twelve cell-salts and their pathological action are given in plain and simple terms.
The wisdom of the ages along the lines leading to physical perfection, in material expression, is in this wonder-book, concentrated and made understandable to the average reader. *Price,* $1.00

Address: Dr. GEORGE W. CAREY
P. O. Box 293 Los Angeles, Cal.

Russian Cooking in Russian surroundings —delicious home food, ices, drinks—with intellectual people about you, can be found at
THE RUSSIAN INN
57 West 37th Street New York City
Phone: Greeley 6567

The NATION is a member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations which regularly audits and attests all figures given. A. B. C.

Situation Wanted

YOUNG MAN, College graduate, experienced teacher and stenographer, wishes summer, if not permanent, employment in teaching, secretarial or other work of an educational character. "E" c/o The Nation.

HOTEL PURITAN
390 Commonwealth Ave.
BOSTON
Solicits the patronage of readers of the Nation.
Globe-trotters say the Puritan is one of the most homelike and attractive hotels in the world.
Wholly reasonable rates.
Send for our booklet with its guide to Boston and its historic vicinity.
N. A. COSTELLO, Manager.

WANTED:—THREE APARTMENTS
unfurnished in same building in New York City.
No. 1. Containing living room or studio, dining room, kitchen, two bedrooms, bathroom and maid's room.
No. 2. Containing living room or studio, bedroom and bath.
No. 3. Containing living room or studio, bedroom and bath.
Location preferably out of the usual beaten paths, something not usually rented if possible, and preferably in a private house altered for such purpose. Nothing South of Greenwich Village nor North of 72nd Street will be considered. Occupancy October 1st, 1919.
Address Charles H. Davis, Bass River, Cape Cod, Massachusetts.

READ what the boys in Leavenworth call "the best thing yet," WHO ARE THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS?, just revised, 10 cents each, less in quantities.
Work for their release by sending contribution and helping to gather 100,000 names to petition to President Wilson.
For booklet and petition, address Jules Wortsman, Treasurer, FRIENDS OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS, 302 Grand St., Brooklyn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1919 No. 2817

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, Associate Editors — LINCOLN COLCORD, FREDA KIRCHWEY

DAVID T. POTTINGER, Business Manager
MIRIAM R. WALTER, Circulation Manager

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Four dollars per annum, postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $5.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, NEW YORK. Chicago Office: Room 1348, People's Gas Bldg. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Headley Bros., Pub., Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 995

EDITORIALS:
- The Peace That is No Peace 998
- Due Process of Law 999
- Raiding as an Aid to Faith 1000
- Advertising and the Press 1000
- Humor 1001

GOMPERS TRIUMPHANT. By Charles Patrick Sweeney 1002

THE IDOL OF COMPENSATION. By Maria Moravsky 1004

ORLANDO OUT. By Arthur Livingston 1006

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:
- Paving the Road to Revolution. By William MacDonald 1008

A RECEIVERSHIP FOR CIVILIZATION. By Lincoln Colcord 1009

THE SUMMER OF PEACE. By Leonora Speyer 1011

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 1011

CORRESPONDENCE 1012

LITERATURE:
- Salvation by History 1014
- A Princeton Massinger 1015
- A History of Religions 1015
- A Proconsul's Fruitful Years 1016
- Aspects of Mid-America 1017

BOOKS IN BRIEF 1017

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 1019

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 1021

EUROPEAN criticism of the treaty and of President Wilson is increasing and not decreasing. Thus Austin Harrison in two articles denounces the pact most bitterly in *The English Review*. We extract a few phrases: "The conditions of peace which are to be dictated to Germany have never been equalled in history. In their meticulous laceration, their continuous stringency, their throttle-hold on the vitals of a nation, they are without a precedent; in comparison Brest-Litovsk was a nursery peace; it means simply this: the new democratic Germany is to be refused opportunity, that is, hope; so far as Germany is concerned, such terms signify economic paralysis, widespread poverty, indefinite misery, famine, chaos." *The Ploughshare*, an organ of the British Friends, speaks of "the follies and cruelties" involved in the treaties and is convinced that they "will ere long become scraps of paper." The London *Nation*, in admitting the complete failure of President Wilson at Paris, seeks to excuse it by laying the blame in part upon "the failure of all those forces in England and America which, acting together, might have guaranteed his triumph." The London *Daily Herald* declares that the "terms are as farcical as they are wicked. They cannot be fulfilled and ought not to be. Any nation which insists upon them is making a public exhibition of its malice, ignorance, and folly." Strong resolutions against the peace terms, the blockade, conscription, and the war with Russia have been passed by all descriptions of British trade-union, socialist, educational, and religious bodies, and such resolutions are increasing in number. Yet hardly an intimation of this has appeared in the American daily press, which for the most part appears more than content to allow the public to go on in blissful ignorance of the state of liberal and radical opinion in Europe, and of the actual condition of affairs there.

THE fall of Orlando marks the beginning of the disappearance of the Big Five who have done such mischief to the world in Paris. The next to go will probably be Clemenceau, for he is already quoted as saying that as soon as the treaty is signed he will resign because of his age. But he is not to go without one more fight, for it is already announced that he will have to explain his actions in a speech in the Chamber this week. That he will once more win a victory, we cannot doubt—even though the fall of Orlando is reported to be reacting in France upon the Tiger himself. The strikes that were so threatening seem for the moment again subdued, the Government having made eleventh-hour concessions to the miners and to the street railway men in Paris. No one can even guess whether there will be a revolution, and if so when it will come. Yet the steady rise in the cost of living continues in a most ominous fashion and the financial situation is still to be grappled with. In Italy, too, there are serious rumblings, incessant strikes, and the same curious vacillation between mere unrest and a violent overturn. As for Nitti, Orlando's successor, it is much to his credit that he has opposed the extremist Italian land-grabbing, but the make-up of his Cabinet will not in the least satisfy the radicals.

AS was to be expected, the sinking of the German high-seas fleet has produced much satisfaction in Washington naval circles—if, indeed, it has not been connived at in England. If not, of what was Admiral Beatty thinking to let these captured vessels lie off by themselves with no effective British guards? Naturally, there is great anger in London at this loss of a large reinforcement of the British fleet. It will be recalled, however, that Mr. Wilson has been frequently reported as urging in Paris that the entire German fleet be sunk, while Secretary Daniels on his return from Europe gave out a statement that the German battleships were of no value to us because they were of such small bunker capacity as to make them of no service—as to prove, he might have added, that they were not at all a menace to America, as he and others deluded this country into believing in 1916-17. But in France, too, there will be anger; the French fleet was so eager for a large section of the Kaiser's ships as to make it certain that there will be bitter criticism of the lax British supervision of these trophies of the blockade. *The Nation* regrets that the German naval vessels were not converted into peaceful carriers, but hopes that this fate may be reserved for the Allied and American war-vessels. Not till all navies disappear shall we have real freedom of the seas—and peace.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE British Government came out very poorly in its reply to the Walsh-Dunne report on Irish atrocities. After waiting two weeks, during which time a shocked public opinion and an alarmed press were clamoring for a refutation of the scandal, the Government, through James Ian Macpherson, Chief Secretary for Ireland, issued from Dublin Castle on June 17 a statement denying the charges of Messrs. Walsh and Dunne, and attacking them as prevaricating agitators. This statement satisfied nobody. Even the conservative London press admitted it to be a weak attempt to quell the popular clamor that had been aroused, and generally concluded its comment by urging the Government to deal sincerely with the Irish question and to devise an acceptable Irish policy; while the liberal press was outspoken in its condemnation. Said the London *Daily News*: "The public will note halting admissions in some of Mr. Macpherson's denials. His statements scarcely conceal the fact that the present government of Ireland is purely a military occupation and that the bulk of the population is organized against it. The power of the Sinn Fein is written all over Mr. Macpherson's reply." In rejoinder to Mr. Macpherson, Messrs. Walsh and Dunne addressed on June 23 a communication to the American Commission at Paris which will only add to the confusion of the British Government. Going immediately to the heart of the question, this letter points out that "the reply of Mr. Macpherson completely dodges the demand for an impartial commission of investigation," and goes on to state that the American Commission for Irish Independence is in possession of detailed and authoritative proof of all its original charges, and is willing to present this proof to any impartial court of inquiry.

BEFORE the Senate Military Committee, on June 16, General March testified that Great Britain and the United States have an understanding that each shall maintain a military establishment four times larger than before the war. Who authorized that understanding and who negotiated it? We all remember the statement of Admiral Sims about the pre-war "conversations" between naval attachés of the same Powers. The *New York Tribune* of June 18, commenting editorially on General March's testimony, says most truly that "the arrangements read like an Entente alliance on the model of the understanding which subsisted between Great Britain and France." The *Tribune* is precisely right. The orthodox technique of the war-making procedure is as follows: secret diplomatic covenants, usually in the form of treaties, followed by secret "informal conversations" between naval and military attachés of the conniving powers, to settle the details of carrying out the provisions of these covenants. It cannot be too often reiterated that the secret treaties published at Petrograd are one of the two points that determine the straight line of Allied policy; the other being the war itself, including the armistice and the peace. Without the Russian Revolution, the secret treaties would never have been published, and the world would have had to make the best guess it could about the genuineness of the Allies' pretensions. But fortunately they were published, and the world has documentary evidence that the Allies waged a war of deceitfulness in behalf of the secret treaties; and that they have now established a peace of crookedness—in fulfilment of the secret treaties. And it is precisely a repetition of this same iniquitous sequence, a few years hence, that General March intimates.

LITTLE by little the trouble about Russia comes to light. The fifty-million-dollar six and one-half per cent. three-year credit of the Imperial Russian Government, due on June 18, defaulted. The bankers who had floated the issue in 1916 announced that they were forming a protective committee to look after the interests of the bondholders. The usual names appear. This loan is the first of several that were floated in this country, another issue at five and one-half per cent. maturing in 1921. The interest on this and the one just defaulted has been paid regularly out of moneys or out of the sale of supplies held here for the defunct Russian Government. Mr. S. Ughet, the financial attaché to that shadow of a shade the Russian Embassy—think of an Embassy representing a Government that has been dead a year and a half—holds out a reasonable expectation that Admiral Kolchak's Government will ultimately foot the bill; which intention no doubt goes far to offset any little drawbacks of a secondary nature that might make against the Admiral's recognition by the organized exponents of democracy and liberty. Mr. Polk, the Acting Secretary of State, in a communication on the subject, says that when the great Russian people have worked out for themselves "a stable form of government" the State Department "will use its good offices to call such claims to the attention of that Government." We are not afraid to wager that the State Department will do just that, and throw its whole ardent soul into the duty. Mr. Polk says further that "whatever stable Government may ultimately assume control in Russia, it is to be expected that it will follow the practice which enlightened Governments have always followed, of recognizing the legitimate loans of prior Governments." Again we will wager that this is to be expected. Query: would Bolshevism lose some trifle of its horrors—something, maybe, like eighty or ninety per cent. of them—if only Lenine would show a little more interest in paying those bills? Or even if he had not made the shocking *faux pas* of saying that as that money was loaned the Czar to perpetuate the Russian people's enslavement, he could not see why the Russian people should feel any obligation in the matter? He had logic and reason with him, of course; but what are they among statesmen? The course of our State Department in the whole Russian business has displayed little enough of these qualities, and even less of any decent regard for outstanding facts.

THE Canadian strike, after weeks of pacific deadlock, has gone into an ugly phase. Despite repeated assertions of the Mayor of Winnipeg that the strike was rapidly collapsing, the Government finally took the aggressive and arrested ten prominent leaders, charging them among other things with sedition. It promptly came to serious clashes between the strikers and the authorities, with some bloodshed, whereupon the city was turned over to the military, and the policy of blood and iron is on. A special tribunal has been set up by the Federal Immigration Department, and the non-Canadian-born leaders, whether English or Russian, are to be deported. It is needless to say that the outcome of these tactics will be watched with eagerness on this side of the border by those who believe that all such demonstrations should be met in a really Prussian spirit. For the present the outlook is dark. From one of *The Nation's* most reliable and conservative informants in Canada comes this word: "Things are serious here; it looks as if we may have a universal proletarian revolution soon." Watched-for revolutions boil slowly,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but it would be idle to deny the gravity of the situation, which is not likely to be ameliorated when the Canadian troops who have been burning and looting cantonments and villages in England, out of anger at the delays in returning them to their homes, reach their native soil.

THE attack by Villa upon Juarez passed off very luckily. The American troops once more entered Mexican territory, with trifling loss pursued the Villistas, whose shots were falling on American soil, and drove them into the hills. The Carranza Government, which might have bitterly resented this invasion, protested with a diplomatic suavity so marked as to make it obvious that it was for the purpose of keeping the record straight. Undoubtedly General Cabell's troops did Carranza a service this time, even if President Wilson's dictum, "Villa dead or alive," remains unfulfilled. But the unhappy character of the situation remains. We profess to be a big brother to Mexico, but Villa seems to have no difficulty in drawing arms from the United States, and we do not settle down to any policy of really constructive friendliness and aid. The talk of armed intervention persists, additional recruits are being enlisted for the Mexican border, some two thousand in all, and Mexico City is quite aware of the intriguing that goes on upon this side of the Rio Grande. It is high time that Mr. Wilson came back and devoted himself to this problem of the Americas—since whatever we do in Mexico affects electrically all the South American republics.

THE more thoughtful leaders of the church, we are happy to note, are speaking out with growing frankness and force against misguided attempts to suppress by violence the spread of ideas, and to turn popular suspicion and hatred against those who hold radical views of any sort. A statement given out by ten well-known clergymen, George Alexander, Charles R. Brown, Henry E. Cobb, Henry S. Coffin, Harry E. Fosdick, William P. Merrill, Frank Mason North, Howard C. Robbins, William Austin Smith, and Ralph W. Stockman, contains the following recommendations:

> That all men and women of good will set themselves to influence public opinion through every available medium against lawless measures by whomsoever they may be employed.
>
> That they resolve to see that fair hearings and just trials are given to men, irrespective of their political or economic opinions, so that it may be truly said that in America no man's case, be he an I. W. W. or a Bolshevist or the most reactionary conservative, is prejudiced by an appeal to popular feeling, and in particular that they set themselves against the counsels of hate, whose effect upon the rising generation can only be to pile up future disaster for mankind.
>
> Since, in the judgment of the Attorney General of the United States, existing laws against criminal terrorism are adequate, and since free discussion is essential for the exposure of economic and political errors, that the attempt be abandoned to coerce minority opinion, so long as it does not promote disorder, and to defeat social change by repressive legislation.

The statement will carry weight, not only because of the standing of the signers, but by reason of the common sense, to say nothing of the Christianity, of the pronouncement itself. How hard it is for the truth to make its way in the public press is illustrated by the misrepresentation to which these gentlemen are subjected by the *New York Times*, which prints their statement under the caption, "Urge Move to Halt Red Rule. Ten Prominent Clergymen Issue Plea to Down Bolshevism."

THESE pesky Bolsheviks who are so disturbing to the Senatorial mind insist upon turning up everywhere, in the least desirable places. There was one who bobbed up from New Mexico the other day at the National Democratic Conference at Chicago. This fellow simply refused to accept the doctrine that all is well with the party and America, and that therefore there is nothing to be done but to pass resolutions congratulating everybody upon our victory and upon our prosperity. Instead, he offered a resolution declaring that the Republican party is the truly reactionary party and demanding that the Democratic party, in order to demonstrate its liberality, put itself on record as favoring, first, the immediate repeal of the Espionage Act; second, the revocation of the powers of the Post Office Department to censor publications and to suppress the circulation of periodicals or letters; third, the guarantee to labor employed in the Government departments of the right to speak and negotiate, and to voice its complaints through spokesmen of any temporary or permanent organization of whatever name, class, or character; and fourth, opposition to a large standing army and compulsory military training. Needless to say, when this bomb was exploded everybody took to cover and this dangerously radical resolution was hastily referred for interment to a committee of three, who will promptly see to its obsequies. The animus behind this resolution is clearly apparent from the fact that the proposer has a German name and that his family has been American for only three generations. How this wicked blood does tell!

THAT the Southern States should down to this day be without accurate vital statistics has long been a source of amazement. Even in those cities where some efforts have been made to compile the most fundamental statistics, they have been vitiated by a deliberate refusal to take note of the colored population. Now, the Board of Health of the State of Georgia has decided to move in the matter and has prepared for the coming session of the Georgia Legislature several bills which would compel complete records of all births, deaths, marriages, and divorces. Up to this time, as the Board says, statisticians have had to guess at both the births and the deaths. More than that, the Board is coupling with these statistical recommendations compulsory sanitary measures to be applied to rural and suburban schools and to hotels, in addition to a requirement that both parties to a marriage must submit health certificates before a license can be issued. If true and accurate records could be kept throughout the Southern States it would be an enormous advantage to many others besides those who are interested merely in statistics. Take the Negro problem alone; it cannot be worked out as quickly and as effectively as it ought to be until we can get all the facts as to the existing conditions among the race. Are they or are they not diseased to an alarming extent? What is the rate of increase? Is there, or is there not, undue child mortality? Today, no one can answer questions like this. If to these vital statistics we could add reliable figures as to crime, we should begin to know all dimensions of the Negro problem. It is not to be solved by denunciation or prejudice or emotion of any kind, except as its solution demands honest goodwill on both sides. But it does require knowledge, and legislation such as Georgia contemplates will be one means of securing it. We trust that the Legislature will act promptly and favorably.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Peace That is No Peace

"WE have made a peace, but it is not *the* peace," wrote Clarendon in 1856. It is not *the* peace which has been made this week in Paris; it is merely a stage which we have reached in the progress of those terrible forces which have been unleashed by the war. No peace so wicked, so hypocritical, so contrary to every Allied pretence, can endure—of that there can be no doubt whatever, least of all in Paris. That the Germans would succumb to *force majeure* this journal has had no doubt whatever. In Berlin in March last it was as plain as a pikestaff that any treaty would have to be signed, that despite all protestations, despite the correctness of their assertions that they have been tricked and betrayed by Mr. Wilson's promise of the Fourteen points, the Germans were themselves so bankrupt in moral power and righteousness, so exhausted physically and nervously, and so destitute of unselfish moral leadership or of leadership of any kind, that the acceptance of any peace was inevitable. It would have taken rare moral steadfastness, a Spartan courage, a readiness to see millions of their fellow-citizens die of hunger before their eyes because of the brutal and inhuman blockade of the Allies, in order to say no to Versailles. The Germans should have said no. They owed it to themselves and to the world to do so. It would have taken them a long step toward the restoration of their own self-respect and manhood—but it was beyond their moral power.

And so they will continue to pay the price for the wickedness of their former leadership and of their own conniving at that wickedness in high places which existed long before the war. They are now suffering for the political immorality of Bismarck, for the crimes of their militaristic system, for their whole autocratic and aristocratic and caste order of society, for their incredible vanity and still more incredible pride. For the Germany of 1914 there must in any event have come a day of reckoning—or there is no use in believing in the eternal verities, in believing that crimes against the rights and liberties of a whole people avenge themselves. So the Germans are paying anew for the "scrap of paper," for the brutal subjugation of Belgium, for the destruction of Northern France, for the shelling of women and children in lifeboats, for numberless crimes against humanity which gave to their enemies the excuse for wanton brutalities, for shameless hypocrisies, for the starving of nations, for sinking to the German level in many a council room. Yes, the Allies are avenged, and the world's morality. The Germans in this hour of agony and humiliation have had left only the will to make what they themselves call a magnificent gesture—the sinking of their fleet, a gesture which merely reveals anew to the world their utter moral bankruptcy.

Utter moral bankruptcy—that sums up Berlin today, and it has these five long years. Not that their worship of force, or their belief that might makes right and that the issue of progress or retrogression can be determined on the battlefield has set them particularly apart. Their depraved gods the Allies worship, too, if in lesser degree and with far greater skill in making black seem white. It is the utter inability of the Germans to understand the minds and desires and the moral reactions of the plain people of the world which has constituted their chief intellectual failure, next to the worship of the state which has led to their downfall. But it is not necessary again to dwell either upon their shortcomings or upon their present inability as a nation to gauge the situation, to make honest confession, and to start anew on a basis of honesty and righteousness and truth-telling to themselves and to the outside world. But the question now is whether Germany will survive at all, whether any Government can endure under these treaty conditions, Germany being half slave, half free. As to the future, prophecy is idle; much depends upon the spirit of the Allies. If it continues the same as at present, if the Allied administration of Germany is to be carried on with the ruthlessness of a Lloyd George, the brutalities of a Clemenceau, and the hypocrisies of a Wilson, the Germans have still far to go on the downward path toward chaos and anarchy. Toward this they are apparently headed now, if only because of their complete lack of leadership, the absence of any programme of regeneration and reconstruction, or of any moral purpose. Hunger, famine, and exhaustion have wreaked their will, as well as years of political immorality. The Government of Bauer is obviously the merest makeshift, set up to be execrated in German history because it signed the document no nation should ever have signed or been called on to sign. Because of the folly of the four old men in Paris who have created a wilderness and called it a peace, who have prated of justice and yet deliberately have drawn a document against which the humane and liberal and democratic forces of the world are everywhere crying out, the Germans may have both the treaty and Bolshevism or worse.

That this crime at Paris will have its logical consequences, there can be no question. It is bound to bring retribution in its train as certainly as was the rape of Belgium. There is a divine, immutable law in these matters; the fall of Orlando shows that it works as remorselessly as a glacier and as steadily. What individuals do now, is of little moment; what the great unleashed forces of humanity will do, is everything. The social upheaval will not stand still merely because Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Wilson, having laid on, now say: "Hold, enough!" Block that movement to some degree they and their kind may and will; they may buy off or drug labor and the vast forces of democracy by one device or another. None the less the forces of liberty will move on; the existing capitalistic order has signed its own death warrant in Paris; it has shown that it can plunge the whole world into chaos and misery; and then has shown that it did not know how to extricate itself honorably and wisely from its own Armageddon. What *The Nation* said when the treaty appeared, it repeats now: The world is henceforth divided into two camps, radicals and reactionaries; the real, true revolution which is to free humanity has but begun. It ought to come without violence and force, but come it will, and it matters not for the moment that few can see clearly and that no one can say: "Behold the straight road out of the wilderness!" The Socialists believe that they can, but never were they so discredited by their own acts, their want of faith in themselves, their unreadiness to die for their beliefs. Yet never were we of such complete faith in the eventual triumph of human nature, in the ability of the human mind to work out a plan of salvation which shall bring the greatest happiness to the greatest number, as in this hour when humanity, by reason of the Peace of Paris, has touched the low-water mark of wrong-doing and degradation, when the future is clouded as never before.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Due Process of Law

THE super-patriotic American Federation of Labor, in session at Atlantic City during the past week, has been demonstrating its loyalty to American institutions by denouncing the exercise of the power of the Federal courts as "a blasphemy on the rights and claims of free men in America," and by declaring its purpose to defy "all injunctive decrees that invade our personal liberties . . . and accept whatever consequences may follow." At almost the same time, Judge Charles F. Amidon, in the United States District Court for North Dakota, has been giving us another example of the intelligence, the skill, and the wisdom with which the best members of the Federal judiciary perform their difficult and responsible duties. Forty-two taxpayers brought suit to restrain the State officials from carrying out the industrial programme enacted by the State Legislature at its last session, following a campaign of popular education and constitutional amendment extending at least as far back as 1911. According to the plaintiffs, the use of State funds and the levying of taxes to establish a State bank and State-owned elevators, mills, and packing-houses is a use of the taxing power for private purposes, and the citizen who is compelled to pay taxes for such a purpose is deprived of his property without due process of law, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. In a notable decision, Judge Amidon completely demolishes this contention, and dismisses the suit. Opponents of the law must therefore fight out their case at the polls in the referendum of June 26. The decision deserves attention, not only because it helps make possible that orderly, peaceable, and legal change by which alone can violent revolution be avoided, but because it is an admirable example of the highest type of judicial reasoning, and an excellent illustration of the important function performed by our courts—a function whose value ought not to be forgotten in the present enthusiasm for rapid change and improvement in social affairs.

In the development of law, certainty and continuity are only less important than justice. It is indeed true, as Judge Amidon himself points out, that:

> What may be done by the State to protect its people and promote their welfare cannot be declared by *a priori* reasoning. New evils arise as a result of changing conditions. If the State remains static while the evils that afflict society are changing and dynamic, the State soon becomes wholly inadequate to protect the public. The State must be as free to change its remedies as the evils that cause human suffering are to change their forms.

Yet in order that the changes of law may themselves cause a minimum of inconvenience and suffering, it is necessary to avoid violent breaks in legal development, and to insure certainty in interpretation and execution. This task the courts perform. They must so interpret legislation as to bring about a continuous development of the law, to keep it so far as possible in harmony with economic conditions, and to avoid conflict with the political tendencies of the time. The present decision is an admirable blending of the purely legal, the economic, and the political elements that enter into every constitutional decision.

On the legal side, an examination of precedents leads the judge to the conclusion that in no instance has the Supreme Court held invalid "an exercise of the taxing power of the State for establishing and maintaining an industry which was owned by the State or a municipality."

> The line of legislative power has been steadily advanced as society has come to believe increasingly that its welfare can best be promoted by public as distinguished from private ownership of certain business enterprises. . . . The text writers solemnly inform us that cities cannot be authorized to establish publicly owned coal and wood yards because that would be using the taxing power for a private purpose. The next edition of these works will strike out this language and inform us that such yards are permissible because they are for a public purpose and are publicly owned, citing Jones vs. Portland, 245 U. S. 217. Thus "can" succeeds "can't" in this field of law so rapidly that one can hardly tell which word he is looking at.

Evidently Judge Amidon has not lost his sense of humor.

Turning to the economics of the problem, he continues:

> The people of North Dakota are farmers, many of them pioneers. Their life has been intensely individual. . . . Nearly all their livestock and grain is shipped to terminal markets at St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth. . . . They [the people] believe that . . . the whole system of shipping the raw materials of North Dakota to these foreign terminals is wasteful and hostile to the best interests of the State. . . . The only means through which the people of the State have had any experience in joint action is their State Government. If they may not use that as the common agency through which to combine their capital and carry on such basic industries as elevators, mills, and packing houses and so fit their products for market, and market the same, they must continue to deal as individuals with the vast combinations of those terminal cities and suffer the injustices that always exist where economic units so different in power have to deal one with the other.

Simple language, that, and understanded of the people.

Passing to the politics of the question:

> The foregoing is what a majority of the people of the State have been persuaded to believe by those whose leadership they trust. Whether their grievances are real or fancied, whether their remedies are wise or foolish, are subjects about which the court is not concerned.

The court, therefore, leaving the people of North Dakota free to work out their own salvation in their own way, at the same time brings their action into its proper place in the legal development of the State and nation. The court thus performs a function that is essential if progress is to be anything else than a series of legal jumps.

It is indeed the essential democracy of the decision, combined with its hard common sense, that in large part explains its wisdom. To quote one more passage, this time referring to the action of the people of Massachusetts in amending their Constitution to overrule the decision of the highest State court in the classic case of Lowell vs. Boston:

> Have they not really said to their judges: "You have been wrong all this half century. We never intended those general words in the Constitution to mean what you have been saying they mean and we wish that you wouldn't use them any more to protect practices that have been proven to be economically, morally, and legally unsound, and nullify laws passed for their correction." Is not that the real interpretation of what has happened, not only in Massachusetts, but in the adoption in nearly every State in the Union, during the last fifteen years, of constitutional amendments to correct decisions made under the general provisions which forbid a deprivation of life, liberty, and property without due process of law?

It is words such as these that indicate the temper of the judge qualified to serve in the new day that is upon us, and show once more to a people inclined to be impatient the possibility of ordered progress under law.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Raiding as an Aid to Faith

LAST week the State police and some local detectives descended on the Rand School, the headquarters of the I. W. W., and those of the so-called Left Wing Socialists, in a raid generally corresponding to the one perpetrated upon the Russian Soviet Commercial Bureau the week before. Again the unconscionable Mr. Stevenson appears at the head and front of the ill-advised proceeding, but this time, it seems, the Lusk Committee accepts the legal responsibility. The warrants were made out by city magistrates in behalf of members of this curious tribunal. So, while the affair may be ever so mistaken, shortsighted, and absurd, there is no apparent question of its legal regularity. Even the employment of the impossible Stevenson cannot in this case be gainsaid except upon the ground of general decency, for from all accounts he is acting under the responsible direction of the Lusk Committee; and if this body thinks proper to employ this sort of agent, it has the legal right to do so. The case was promptly brought to trial in the usual court—the newspapers—and the defendants were disposed of in the usual workmanlike manner, without defence, by the usual verdict of suggestion and innuendo. A foreign friend of ours remarked to us the other day that American newspapers were not newspapers, but instruments of lynch law. In the case of the Rand School and its associated victims, they seem, as far as we can judge, with one or two honorable exceptions, to have fulfilled this function admirably.

With regard to the raid on the Soviet Bureau, the most important news, from the point of view of our readers, is that of the resignation of two of the Lusk Committee's interpreters, Professor Alessandro Carasso, and Dr. Vexler of Columbia University. Their stomachs seem not strong enough for the atmosphere in which they have to work. Professor Carasso says manfully: "When I became more intimately acquainted with my colleagues, I felt ashamed for myself, for them, and for those investing them with authority. They were persons lacking knowledge of the profound issues involved." Quite so; it is the illimitable ignorance and impenetrable stupidity of this quixotic crusade that most of all commands the attention of rational persons. No one troubles to question the motives of the Lusk Committee or the Overman Committee; but what is to be thought of committing a judgment on the most important and urgent economic issues in the world to persons who so obviously have not the faintest conception even of what they are? These gentlemen are, no doubt, as honest and single-minded as officeholders can be; but nothing could be clearer than that in talking of Bolshevism or of Americanism, they understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm. Dr. Vexler says with like truth that "Mr. Stevenson and those for whom he works are pursuing the methods of the former Czar of Russia, the methods which created Bolshevism," and brings out the humiliating allegation that a member of the British Secret Service was one of the raiding party—as though, God pity us, we had not enough Stevensons of our own.

The action of these interpreters is a pretty fair sign of the reaction likely to be made upon people of ordinary decency and intelligence, on very brief inspection of the political prairie-dog's-nest tenanted by Mr. Stevenson. We should like to ask, simply, how many converts to an enlightened Americanism the Lusk-Overman methods have made, so far. Also, how many enlightened Americans have had their faith strengthened, and their pride in their country's institutions heightened? Further, how far is the estimated gain offset by the shame and disturbance of those like ourselves who are aware of the utter mischievousness of these methods, who have the very slight knowledge of history necessary to assure ourselves of their inevitable outcome? Do these committees and the citizens who countenance them really think that a people can be raided and harried into a fine glow of devotion to their country? Can Yankee ingenuity hope so to improve upon the Cromwell-Romanoff plan as to make it workable here when it never worked elsewhere? We wish that the State of New York might use its appropriation in putting itself through a course in the writings of Jefferson, Cobden, Lincoln, and the late Mayor Gaynor (who for all his faults had a clear conception of the function of a public servant under a democracy), studying them just long enough to learn what it really is that creates revolutionary terrorism. Professor Carasso has learned it, and we compliment him, and if we all do not learn it effectively in one way (as we so easily may) we shall perforce have to learn it in another.

Advertising and the Press

NO more interesting document has come out of revolutionary Germany than the proposal for the socialization of the Munich press which we print in the International Relations Section accompanying this issue. The work of a man scarcely twenty-two years of age, who is reported to have paid with his young life for his participation in the communistic republic which lasted a brief month, it controlled the press of Munich until May 5 last. During that time the "capitalist" newspapers felt the dictatorship of the proletariat to the full and, as *The Nation* has already pointed out, the proletariat indulged in every unfairness and illiberality with which it charged the ruling classes. Not until the Prussian troops got into Munich—to commit, by the way, as great atrocities as the "Reds," according to the London *Times*—were the established newspapers free to say what they thought or to appear without complete control and censorship of their columns. The Munich Commune was largely the result of the propaganda of Russians like Axelrod, Leviné-Nissen, and Dr. Levien. These Bavarian imitators laid down the same policy as the Lenine Government itself, that freedom of the press would not be permitted until the form of government they desired was established beyond peradventure—then newspapers taking other points of view were to be permitted their say. As confiscation is an integral part of the communistic theory, the papers in Munich were taken from their owners without compensation.

Even before the appearance of the Toller-Nissen Government, the temporary Cabinets that held office after the assassination of President Eisner had decided to create a government monopoly of all advertising in order "to take private profit out of the newspaper business." Just how this was to be done as long as the papers were retained by their capitalistic owners was never worked out. A plan became unnecessary when the Commune decided to make the entire press a Government monopoly by socialization. But everywhere in Europe, in the country of friend and foe alike, this question of the control of the press has become a grave one, and men's minds are more and more turning to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

problem of how the masses can obtain unbiased news as well as the presentation of their thoughts and their points of view. Shall it be by coöperative ownership, as the Non-Partisan League is attempting it in our Northwest, or shall it be after the manner of the new London *Daily Herald* of George Lansbury, by the aid of a few rich men of liberal point of view? Or shall it be by forbidding advertising or making it a State monopoly? In England, the menace of so great a control of press and politics as Lord Northcliffe's needs no explanation. Fortunately for that country, there is a growing sentiment against Lord Northcliffe and an earnest search for a means to check and combat his enormous power.

Would the abolition of advertising reform the press, assuming that it is possible to get at the advertising through the taxation power or the post office? If it were attempted, the newspapers would of course have entirely to recast their present policies and so largely increase the price per copy as to offset the loss of advertising revenue. What sells now for two cents would have to sell for ten or twenty-five cents, if possible. From one point of view this would but be just, when one considers the wealth of material furnished daily, and the fact that the present price per copy does not pay for the paper used, let alone its share of the other costs. The lure of a normal—or abnormal—return on the capital invested would still be there and the price per issue would have to be raised until the profit appeared. But getting profits from other sources would not of course change the character of a newspaper and make it more liberal or more tolerant or more conservative; the human factor behind the paper would still have to be reckoned with. Yet the radicals in Bavaria had the idea that if the advertising disappeared there would be a magic opening up of opportunity for men to enter the newspaper field and to present unpopular and radical views, as well as those of the ruling powers. This by no means follows. The cause of the world-wide dissatisfaction with the daily press lies far deeper; the real dread of advertising is not that through it the press makes profits, but that through it the editorial opinions are controlled or influenced. Had there been no advertising whatever in the Munich press, it would still have been grossly false in its treatment of the revolution and of Kurt Eisner.

To our minds, there is still only one way of controlling the press, and that is by public opinion. Enter the field of official control, and your second estate is worse than your first. We are well aware, of course, that papers like the London *Times* and *Morning Post* seem beyond the reach of influence; all the more reason that there should be concentrated upon other kinds of papers the whole powers of the groups they represent, just as the New York *Call* has been built up here by the loyalty of its readers and the London *Daily Herald* will be supported not only by its backers but by the labor element. Discouragingly hard work it is, but the remedy does not lie in high-handed suppression, like that in Munich and Petrograd, of the offensive papers; it lies in living and letting live, in letting every group have its say, and relying upon the saving processes of time to overthrow error and establish the truth. This is hardly hopeful counsel in a city in which the press has abdicated editorial judgment to an amazing degree and is indulging in greater misrepresentation and lying in writing about Russia and Hungary and the peace treaty than has ever been seen in our time. Yet there is no other way. Striking at the advertising of the press is a cure for nothing.

Humor

CHARLES DICKENS, visiting us in the forties, found us "an unhumorous people," and we wonder how far the charge, which at first sight seems rather odd, would be borne out at present. There is a great deal that passes under the general name of humorous writing, and both in the theatre and in commercial art we have developed a large body of professional fun-making. The editorial paragraph is rather peculiar to American journalism and, perhaps more nearly than any other feature of our literature, meets a fundamental definition of humor. Similarly, the cartoonist's art, as exemplified, say, by Fox and Briggs, regularly presents a large, shrewd, benignant, and perspicacious view of life, which is the first essential of humor. Occasionally the same view is presented in editorial writing, but not often. Sometimes we read an editorial—we saw one in the New York *Sun* last week—which leaves no doubt that the writer thoroughly enjoyed his work. The great bulk of our current humorous literature, however, does not reflect this view. It is superficial, fantastic, metallic, unsubtle; and its mere currency, its apparent acceptability, rather tends to discredit the soundness of the popular instinct for humor.

This is unfortunate, because a people whose sense of humor is not hung on a hair-trigger has a particularly bad prospect at the present time. At the moment when everyone seems to be laying down the law about good citizenship and Americanization and all the rest of it, we might perhaps offer our own nostrum. We would have it obligatory on every citizen diligently to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the great humorists. We would compel him to carry as a *vade mecum*, along with his certification from the Overman Committee and his credentials from the National Security League, pocket copies of Cervantes, Rabelais, and Artemus Ward, and make him liable for summary examination on their contents at any time by any policeman, soldier, or other officer. If humor is the saving thing, as no doubt it is, the great engine of compulsion should be put to work to inculcate it, along with the other necessary elements of a true and devoted Americanism.

But just here the uncomfortable thought strikes us that we may, after all, with the best intentions, be advocating sedition—or what comes to the same thing. For suppose all our people got their Rabelais by heart, what would happen in the next war? How could the patrioteers and patriotrines, the knitters and the music-suppressors, do any business at all, when everybody, themselves included, would be reminded at once of Diogenes's valiant efforts to help out in the great war with the Gastrolaters? How could Mr. Creel and his ilk manage any propaganda among people whose minds would instantly jump to the table-talk of Homenas, in praise of the Uranopet Decretals? Who could get up and tootle over Bolshevism, remembering the shipload of dignitaries "bound for the council of Chesil, to sift and garble some articles of faith against the new heretics?" The memory of Bridlegoose would permeate the Supreme Court chamber and Eugene Debs would go free. Things would not be at all as they are or have been, and to advocate measures which are likely to change anything, above all the temper of a whole people, is probably seditious. Then, too, in a world that knew Rabelais as he should be known, there would be no Mr. Creel or patriotrines or snooping-committees or Bolshevist-baiters. But perhaps we had better stop here.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gompers Triumphant

By CHARLES PATRICK SWEENEY

IT is the opinion of some who observed the convention of the American Federation of Labor at Atlantic City that it was the last machine-controlled meeting of that organization. That same opinion has been expressed with respect to many of the conventions in years gone by. From the press table, close to the platform where Mr. Gompers and his executive council run the affair, and from the viewpoint of a mingler among the delegates, the opinion would seem to have a basis of little more than desire. Mr. Gompers was reëlected with only a single delegate—James Duncan of Seattle—brave enough to say no, and the powerful executive council was continued as of old. There was not a vote against the machine's proposal to give the various trades departments a seat each in future conventions, although it was quite obvious that this move was intended simply to accord a voice to several reactionaries who have been defeated by their own internationals—of whom James O'Connell, the ex-president of the International Association of Machinists and former vice-president of the American Federation of Labor, is one. Despite his overturn by the rank and file of his own organization, the machine was loyal to him and made him president of the Metal Trades Department by exerting its tremendous influence among officers of the associated internationals. The League of Nations was indorsed, and so was the labor charter, which latter President Wilson admitted had been "somewhat weakened." As a matter of fact, Mr. Gompers shut off debate on both subjects after the President's cablegram had been read, so that no delegate was permitted to question the wisdom of indorsing guarantees to labor which had been "weakened" since they were made. And the convention, the next day, swallowed without a word another Wilsonian message saying no fears need be entertained on the score of the predominance of the British Dominions in the labor conference, because the problems of the Dominions are the same as our own, and because those common problems make the Dominions and the United States colleagues in action, with Great Britain out of the question, so to speak. Blandly, the convention put the 3,260,000 organized workers of the country on record as agreeing that the sentences of "some" violators of the Espionage Law were well deserved, and that others might deserve a pardon, but that none were so worthy as to be particularly mentioned, in spite of Eugene Deb's well-known services in organizing the miners in 1900. Mr. Gompers conveniently stepped out of the hall while the machine put through the anti-immigration resolution and tacked on an amendment singling out Mexicans for exclusion, thus wrecking the Pan-American Federation of Labor created only last November at Laredo, Texas, with Mr. Gompers in the name of American labor extending the hand of brotherhood to the workers across the border. During the debate on the League of Nations, Mr. Gompers flatly refused a request from the floor that Miss Margaret Bondfield, delegate from the British Trades Union Congress, be permitted to throw light upon the attitude of British labor toward the project. All these things happened.

But something different also happened. Mr. Gompers and the executive council engineered a direct attack upon Frank P. Walsh and Basil M. Manly. Ordinarily this could not be. These two men have been too close, too serviceable to the labor movement to be assailed by the leaders of labor except for some tremendously important reason. Through a lieutenant, President Shea of the Theatrical Mechanics, Gompers accused Manly of drafting a resolution, introduced into Congress by Senator Poindexter and Representative Clyde M. Kelly, creating a commission to inquire into labor conditions, and of leading the list of prospective labor representatives with the name of Walsh, Gompers being given second place. In referring to Walsh and Manly, John H. Frey, the Gompers spokesman, said: "We know our enemies and how to fight them, but God deliver us from our friends." This elicited considerable agreement from the international officers. The stated reason for the attack was that "none but direct representatives of the workers should speak for the labor movement," but the anti-machine men find beneath this excuse the fear on the part of Gompers and his council (known to the insurgents as the College of Cardinals) that Walsh has become too strong with the rank and file; that he is altogether too progressive; that he could solidify the opposition, put courage where there is now timidity, and generally clean the house of organized labor, if he were given another opportunity like that afforded him by the War Labor Board chairmanship. To those who do not know Walsh or his antecedents, it might have sounded reasonable to hear Gompers's spokesmen declare that "theorists, who don't know the problems of the workers," should not essay to speak for them. But, it was a long time after Gompers and his more powerful henchmen had ceased working and begun to draw salaries from international unions and the American Federation of Labor, that Walsh graduated from the shoe factory to the railroad yard, and from the yard to the train, and from the train into stenography, and finally into the law. And this is what a significantly large number of men who were silent in the convention have been saying since it adjourned.

It is impossible to go into all of the actions and reactions of the convention. Everything that Mr. Gompers dictated be done was done. What he dictated be omitted was omitted. Contradictions of the most glaring character were perpetrated without a blush. In one instance, the initiative and referendum and recall in politics were demanded; in another, when James A. Duncan of Seattle introduced a resolution providing for a model uniform system of initiative and referendum for the international unions, he was assailed as an enemy of trade unionism, and his cause was buried under an avalanche of negative votes. Freedom for Ireland was demanded at all costs, but no attention was paid to Andrew Furuseth's argument that the League and the labor charter perpetuate slavery, at least on the Persian Gulf, if not in many other territories. Equal pay for equal work in principle was perfunctorily adopted as an aim of the organization, but there was great applause, after reference to confinement pensions in Russia, at a flag-waving declaration by Matthew Woll that "we don't want any women to work in our mills and factories." At one point, industrial unionism was declared to be a menace to the workers, and on the same day, in spite of the objection of the International Spinners Union, it was decreed that there should be industrial union-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism in the textile industry—that is, that all unions of textile workers should be amalgamated. The motive, of course, was political. John Golden has been endeavoring for a number of years to gain control of the spinners, who are ninety-five per cent. organized. To gain control of the spinners means, of course, to gain control of their treasury. While all these contradictions were being written into the law and principle of the American Federation of Labor, men sat in the convention hall who jeered in their souls at the performance, wishing for a day of freedom. What silenced them? The machine. Even as it ground out its manufactures, it served warning on potential insurgents by settling jurisdictional fights in favor of regulars. In a jurisdictional fight one union seeks to absorb the membership or part of the membership of another. Membership means money with which to fight craft battles and it also means representation on the floor of the convention. No loyal unionist, no matter how much he differs with the powers that be, feels justified in menacing the existence of the craft union which has confidence enough in him to elect him to office. How can the machine control so many delegates as to crush the opposition at all times? Any British labor statistician can answer the question by indirection. Over there they have no such performance as a steam-rollered convention of the Trades Union Congress. Why? Because fifty-five per cent. of the membership proceeds from the rank and file—that is, from mill and factory—to the convention hall. Their election as delegates does not mean yearly meal tickets to them; it means opportunity for them to go and express the will of their fellows. They have nothing to lose if they incur the displeasure of the leaders. They are independent. In the American Federation of Labor convention—and this virtually tells the whole story—it is conservatively figured that ninety per cent. of the representatives of international unions are salary-drawing officials, who no longer work at anything but trade-union politics. Further, if the fifty-six organizers in the convention lose favor they also lose their jobs.

A resolution, from the Pacific Coast, committing the Federation to the proposition that workers should elect their own foremen, was negatively reported by the committee on resolutions. It is to be remembered that all committees are appointed by President Gompers. In speaking for the resolutions committee, John P. Frey said that if foremen were to be elected by the workers it would only be a step toward their representation on the boards of directors of corporations. On Monday, a cable from Paris quoted the views of Bernard M. Baruch, of Wall Street, as to the industrial revolution that is taking place in the world. He flatly said that the workers must be represented on boards of directors. Is Barney Baruch closer to the workers than is the American Federation of Labor?

Even to think of any other than the old craft form of organization is "secession"—more than that, Bolshevism. And, as if to indicate the presence of a considerable "secession" sentiment, the executive council proposed a rule—even more drastic than the Espionage Law—forbidding any central labor union from taking a strike vote or calling a strike or from "encouraging, inculcating, or advancing, whether by circular or motion, any movement" aiming to change the present form of international or national organization. This attempt was too roughshod, even for many representatives of internationals, and after a fight the rulers of the convention amended the resolution so as to make it an American Federation of Labor crime, punishable by revocation of the charter, for a central labor union to take a strike vote or call a strike. This stops groups of workers from joining in so-called "sympathy strikes." But, as several delegates frankly said on the floor, the resolution is only a scrap of paper, tossed into the fires of revolt against centralized domination of the organized workers.

Daniel Tobin, treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, had no hesitancy in stating to the convention that he has seen two hundred different circulars sent about the country by central labor unions urging a more democratic form of organization. Is it possible that central labor bodies will find a means of overcoming the autocracy that now holds the organized workers of the country in its grip, by organizing an outlaw conspiracy against the monarchs of the internationals? If so, it will come about, according to the silent but calculating rebels, as a consequence of the growth of the Labor party sentiment, which was given an ice-cold bath by the executive council and therefore by the convention. The situation in Chicago offers an example. There exists there one of the most powerful central bodies in the country—the Chicago Federation of Labor. Mr. John Fitzpatrick is its president, and he is also the leader of the Labor party of Cook County. He did not ask the convention to endorse the Labor party movement. He and his friends are going to carry it on, regardless of the American Federation of Labor. At the same time, labor parties are springing up in scores of industrial communities, and in every case they spring up in the central labor body. This central labor body is the nearest approach to a channel for industrial self-government that is now afforded the organized workers. In local unions the workers meet as fellow-craftsmen. In central unions they meet as fellow-workers, every local union in the community being represented by men eighty per cent. of whom are toilers. It is these men whom the salaried, non-working international officers would command to be deaf to the heresies of this mad, modern world. But they will not be gagged forever, say the silent wishers for the overthrow of the autocrats. They will form Labor parties, and they will band together naturally as Labor partyites, not as seceders—at first. There was once a first Republican national convention, and there was once a first national convention of the American Federation of Labor, and it was not until after the fact that the real significance of the respective occasions was comprehended by the Bourbons.

No one doubts the devotion of Mr. Gompers to the cause of labor. Has not his whole life been devoted to the fight? Time was when they called him an anarchist and insulted him in public places. He bore it all, knowing that he was not an anarchist, and knowing that insults would not defeat a noble cause. But Mr. Gompers is old. He has built up by a life's work a great organization. It is his achievement. These men who gather about him are his friends and supporters. They are attacking him from neither the right nor the left; for they are with him in his struggle to have labor, for instance, declared not to be a commodity. True, it would be a fine thing if he would say to himself that possibly these men with new ideas might have the same zeal and ultimately the same success that he has had, and if he would promise himself not to call them Bolsheviki. But, with old men, such is not the way of life. So the would-be democratizers of labor unionism are Bolsheviki. Some day, possibly, they will be calling young men the twenty-first century equivalent of this aspersion.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Idol of Compensation

By MARIA MORAVSKY

IT is natural for foreigners to criticise things in America. It is much easier to see faults and imperfections when one is fresh from abroad, especially the faults of old things and old authorities. If you worship the old institutions and the old great names with all the ardor of youth, just because of the sweet remembrance of the past, then the foreigner has the right to challenge your attention. This is one of the reasons why Americans dislike foreigners.

I read your Emerson for months before I took the liberty to criticise his works. I started to study "the greatest American idealist" modestly and reverently, with the purpose of bettering my mind and my English. Every morning early I would take my pile of books and read enthusiastically. Sometimes I was so absorbed in my reading that I forgot bath and breakfast. The beauty of Emerson's style appealed to me strongly. I tasted lingeringly every phrase, every parallel, every illustration. I would repeat them joyfully, translate them into my own language, in order to understand them better; then I repeated them again many times in English. It was a great discovery for me—this sweet music of the superb Emerson's thought and words.

But by and by I began to hear in it strange dissonances. His articles were full of kindness and goodwill; love for humanity blazed from every page, and yet I felt that an unconscious cruelty was hidden in some of them. He preached harmony of life, his soul seemed to be full of sweet content, but to me he sometimes resembled a scared child who sings in the dark forest trying to cheer himself. When I heard these notes of discord I would drop the little green volume and meditate for a long time before I could continue my reading. I tried to analyze his philosophy. I thought hard over every doubtful sentence. I tried to judge him fairly, as a loving child would judge its kind old grandfather. But I found it absolutely impossible to agree with some of his most sincere beliefs. I hope that Americans will excuse me. We cannot live as our fathers lived, we cannot and must not believe in the same theories. A new generation cannot be fed by the sweet old idealism which, like old jam, is covered with mold.

Emerson's Essay on Compensation, inspired by the thirst for justice, is untrue and pitiless. Emerson's soul longed for the harmony which the old religion could not furnish. He ceased to believe that we can find punishment and reward in the next life; he was courageous enough to reject this ephemeral consolation, but could not altogether abandon the idea. So he tried to convince himself and his followers that compensation exists here on our earth.

He starts with examples from natural history. He appeals to polarity, or action and reaction. He says that light and darkness, heat and cold, male and female—all indicate that the world is dual. "So is every one of its parts," adds he, without proving it. Parallels are always used by poets and preachers, but parallels prove nothing. Emerson talks of mechanical forces: "What we gain in power is lost in time." He wants to apply this formula to men. Unfortunately men are not machines. ". . . dualism underlies the nature and condition of man." Here his sophism begins. "Every sweet hath its sour; every evil its good. Every faculty which is a receiver of pleasure has an equal penalty put on its abuse."

When I read this I recalled the two Russian friends whom met early in the morning. One of them had spent a wild night, full of forbidden pleasures: opium, vodka, the songs of beautiful gypsies. All that exhausted him. His head ached, he swore and yawned continually. His friend, whom he met at the corner of the half-empty street, yawned and swore, too. "Where have you been all night?" asked the prodigal. "Your eyes are red. Tell me your last adventure, and I will tell you mine." "I don't understand what you mean," answered his friend coldly; "I worked all the night at the newspaper office; I am a night proofreader now." You see, the results of the two nights were alike. The honest night-worker had the same compensation: headache, inflamed eyes, and bad mood. Physically it was just, but morally it was against the consoling theory of Emerson's Compensation. Because we are not machines, we receive sometimes evil for evil as well as evil for good.

Emerson thinks Nature wise and just, but Nature is cruel to man. It is a heresy that she "hates monopolies and exceptions." She has her favorites and Parsees, many of them. "The cold climate invigorates," says Emerson. "The barren soil does not breed fevers, crocodiles, tigers, or scorpions." A poor consolation! The barren soil of Moravia does not breed these plagues, but it does not breed bread enough, either. I wonder if the philosopher of fertile America ever saw the picture of Moravian women in harness, ploughing their unkind, stingy fields. It made me weep when I saw it for the first time. Would Emerson repeat to these poor women his heartless consolation: "The cold climate invigorates"? I personally would prefer to live in a warm, enervating climate (which does not invariably breed scorpions and crocodiles) somewhere on the Caucasian coast of the Black Sea, where the soil gives harvests several times a year, without asking too much work from the owners. It is a glorious life to be an idle Caucasian, to live on fruits, lambs, and wine, to play dice and drink Turkish coffee all day long, and to have a quiet conscience in addition. A Caucasian does not need to exploit cheap labor to have all these luxuries. Nature is kind to him, and it is easy to be just when you are not under the pressure of a too "invigorating climate."

History is as unjust to individuals and nations as is Nature. Emerson says that "things refuse to be mismanaged long." How about the centuries of despotism in Russia? The Essay on Compensation was certainly not written for my country. "If the Government is cruel, the governor's life is not safe." It is much safer, however, than the lives of the revolutionists who try to dispose of the cruel Government. For many hundreds of radicals hanged, there was scarcely one despot killed in Russia. But perhaps America is an exception.

"Is a man too strong and fierce for society and by temper and position a bad citizen . . . Nature sends him a troop of pretty sons and daughters who are getting along in the dame's classes at the village school, and love and fear for them smooths his grim scowl to courtesy." Where

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are the idyllic days of the old New England, when all the people sent their children to the same democratic school? And what of your modern millionaires, who have the power to dismiss from the universities the professors with whose ideas they do not agree? It seems to me that it is too long since you read Emerson in your high-school days, and that you have forgotten his sayings.

I do not believe that the consciences of Emerson's contemporaries were as true as patented Geneva watches, and marked punctually every good and evil deed of their owners. Human conscience is capricious: sometimes it hurts us for nothing and sometimes it sleeps quietly amidst crimes. There is a Russian story of a robber who killed a peasant on the open road and went home contentedly, counting the money of his victim. But in the bag of the dead he found a piece of smoked beef, and ate it. After that his conscience ached terribly because, you see, it was Lent. Your beloved Mark Twain, whom we Russians love as much as you do, observed very wisely the ways of consciences. He knew that there are different kinds: some fat and well kept; some humble and thin that never dare to say a word against us. But let them grow and they will eat you up! They are not good regulators of our deeds; they are not the true executors of Inner Compensation.

A philosopher draws a design of his world exactly as a sweet maiden in the old-fashioned home would draw a design of embroidery. The maiden has thousands of multicolored beads; she selects them carefully and puts on her needle one after the other—and out of this mass of colored crumbs there grow roses and birds, garlands, and the initials of her beloved. So a philosopher works with facts. He carefully selects only those which fit his design, his outline of the universe. And then he makes a harmoniously colored theory of life. But the sweet maiden grows old, and when she is a grandmother, her little grandchild finds the dusty embroidery and breaks all the weakened threads with her irreverent fingers, and the flowers and letters of the old design again become just a mass of multicolored beads—material for new designs. Then what is the use of handling these beads of facts, you may ask? It is sad to create beautiful theories of universal harmony, if they are never true. Oh, yes, they are true—temporarily. And they teach us to recognize the subtle shades of facts and the art of combining them. But philosophers must not be too proud and think that their beautiful designs fit the universe forever. If they were humbler and tried to work out a decent system of life for their epoch only, instead of universal theories, they would meet with more real success. But then they would not be philosophers, but social reformers.

Emerson was not a purely philosophical type of thinker, but still he was more philosopher than reformer, and more preacher than philosopher. He does not show us how to get our compensation, but he wants us to believe in it—believe in spite of all the sober facts which prove the contrary. Do not forget that he had been a minister. It is not easy to part with the old religious idea of punishments and rewards. One needs great courage for it.

Emerson lacked this courage. He passed half way—he refused to believe in the church idea of justice. For his times this was an exploit. But he could go no further. He cannot live without believing in compensation, his soul is too scared. His soul is a little child, lost in the gloomy forest of life, who sings, trying to defeat his fear: "There are no bears here, there are no bears. Mother is near. She will come, she will come!" He shuts his eyes and awaits with song the coming of Mother Justice. "Justice is not postponed." "Every secret is told, every crime is punished, every virtue rewarded, every wrong redressed, in silence and certainty." So says he and presses his hand to his great heart, aching for harmony, and repeats: "I am contented, I am contented with life."

But there is no harmony in the world; thousands of male mosquitoes perish, and only one of thousands gets his mate: Nature is a waster and produces the sexes in unequal numbers. And she is as cruel to human beings as to the mosquitoes: whole races, fine and noble, die out and give place to less refined specimens. Splendid mastodons lie in their icy graves in Siberia, and their inferior relatives, the elephants, live and prosper in India. Emerson would say that they do not prosper, that they are compelled to work hard on the fields of the British landowners, and so Nature acted generously in killing the noble mastodons—which thus escaped slavery. But in Siam there are sacred elephants. If they happen to be white, they are worshipped as gods, and enjoy life eating sugar cane dampened with rum. So it was in the South of your country in Emerson's time: those who happened to be born white owned the sugar plantations, drank rum, and beat their slaves. You see how easy it is to jump from one parallel to the other to prove your theory?

But there are noble and brave souls who decline any compensation at all and are courageous enough to go without it. Heroes, who believe not in heavenly nor in earthly reward. They place the law of love above the law of justice. In Emerson's theories there is too much thirst for justice:

"All things are double, one against another: an eye for an eye; a tooth for a tooth; blood for blood; measure for measure." And: "Every crime is punished." And: "Thou shalt be paid exactly for what thou hast done, no more, no less." How about mercy? Great mercy for the sake of which Jesus Christ was crucified? Did he ever preach exact compensation? No, that was the justice of the Old Testament, the cruel law of honest merchants, who know the exact price of every deed. Christianity rejects it. We reject it, too, even in our common, imperfect, everyday life; we contradict it when we forgive criminals. Mercy, love, and pity claim now more and more place in human affairs than the old-fashioned dry-hearted justice, which was only the first step toward happiness.

Emerson was contented, believing that every crime is punished. This unconscious cruelty was created by his belief in personal responsibility. He was very exact, very rigorous with himself; he felt that he was the master of his soul, and he considered others his equals. This is the reason that he taught them such a severe conduct of life. But the human race does not consist of Emersons. Most of us are weak. We are never fully responsible for our actions. We need pity and forgiveness. We cannot pay two cents for two cents all our life, and even if we could, it would be a poor life. The greatest thing in life is love, and the joy of love is to give more than we can receive. If we lived on compensation only, we should be denied the happiness of making gifts and offerings. We should never go unpunished, but we should be deprived of sacrifice. While most of us are too weak for "just compensation," a few are above it. Emerson was mistaken when he wanted us to live on the basis of two cents for two cents, be it the real coins or the moral ones.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Orlando Out

By ARTHUR LIVINGSTON

THE difference between Esau and Victor Emanuel Orlando is this: Esau sold his birthright for a saucer of corn-flakes, while Mr. Orlando threw his away for nothing at all. The bitterness of Mr. Orlando's defeat cannot be softened by any plea that retrospect is better than foresight. The position of Italy in European diplomacy has been so clear for two years past, and Mr. Orlando, at many moments in his premiership, has shown himself so clearly aware of this position, that he can offer no other explanation of his defeat at home and in Paris than that he has allowed Italian policy, so proud of its traditional "objectivity," to be led astray by considerations of the most unsubstantial and "idealistic" nature. To show the measure of the opportunities that he has wasted, one has merely to outline the course of Italian policy from Caporetto to Vittorio Veneto, from Vittorio Veneto to the second Caporetto at Versailles. Those who had their wits about them in the days of atrocious gloom that stretched from October, 1917, to June, 1918, must remember that the one ray of hope in the situation was that the Allies seemed to be acquiring unity with virtue after every defeat, that the Pact of London faded from view with Caporetto, to make way for the Fourteen Points that were welcomed with one shout of approval by everyone, from the *New York Tribune* to the most revolutionary syndicalist in Europe. What was not so clearly perceived at that time was that the diplomatic balance of power in Europe, with the United States in the war, was shifting to Italy.

Italy lost military prestige at Caporetto. From being an efficient aid to the Allies she changed, in appearances, at least, to the position of a dependant. To explain a defeat due wholly and exclusively to shortcomings in the High Command, the legend of a nation in revolution, of socialist sabotage of the war, was studiously created by every agency at the disposal of the Allied Governments. A cry of terror went forth that Italian morale must be braced at all costs. English and French troops were poured into Italy, to do nothing in particular except prepare for the disaster at Saint Quentin. As a matter of fact, Italian morale, in the army and behind the lines, was sound, as the first battle of the Piave magnificently showed. And when the terror subsided with the Austrian repulse from Monte Grappa, the principal casualty to be recorded, aside from a seriously wounded Pact of London, was the famous Allied policy of Mr. Wilson and M. Painlevé, of "driving a wedge" between Austria and Prussia. Caporetto put an end to the Austrophile diplomacy of the Allies; and with the adoption of the Italian point of view toward the Hapsburg monarchy, Italy passed from a position of trailing to a position of leadership in the organization of a new order of things in Central Europe. This was the inheritance which Mr. Orlando received from the falling Boselli ministry. This much Italy had gained from her great defeat.

The Pact of London contained for all the peoples between the Carpathians, the Adriatic, the Ægean, and the Bosphorus, not to mention those of Asia Minor, what they called a menace, and what the Italians call a legend, of an aggressive Italian imperialism. It could be interpreted so as to leave to those people the alternative of choosing between Austrian domination and Italian domination. Caporetto solved their problem by removing the second horn of the dilemma. And the Italians, in the best traditions of their diplomatic objectivity, were not the last to perceive this. From Caporetto dates the inception of the Italo-Jugoslav *rapprochement* which led to the Congress of Rome in April, 1918. The Pact, or, *more italico*, the "Pact," of Rome, provided for the disintegration of Austria-Hungary, the liberation of the "oppressed nationalities," and the application of the principle of friendly understanding to the settlement of the Adriatic question. Therewith Italy took under her protection—of hypothetical value only at that moment—the development of the new states. There were embraces all around.

To the new attitude assumed by Italy toward the Adriatic problem and Central Europe, all the Allied nations reacted with enthusiasm. Italy now entered upon a period of popularity with liberal circles the world over which she had never enjoyed before, and Mr. Orlando was in a position to become the European representative of what became known abroad as Wilsonism, to take the lead in the democratization of Central Europe, and to encircle his own head with an aureola like that which was condensing on Mr. Wilson's brow. This halo, moreover, he seemed quite disposed, for a time, to accept, but with what sincerity and conviction events were to prove. Mr. Orlando was merely "present" at the Congress of Rome. It was one of those "presences" which in diplomatic language signify "nobody home." His intervention in the Congress was in fact capable of creating two impressions: one, that the Pact of Rome represented the official policy of the Italian Government, committing it to a "Wilsonian" settlement of Adriatic difficulties; the other, that it was simply an exchange of views between gentlemen, an unofficial statement of pious principles (like the Fourteen Points) to which the Premier paid social homage as a man, reserving full liberty of action in his capacity as Premier.

The first interpretation Mr. Orlando used for military purposes behind the Austrian lines, and for recruiting purposes in the prison camps of Slavic soldiers. With it also he pacified liberal opposition to his Government at home. It was the consolidating principle of his coalition Cabinet, which included Mr. Bissolati and Mr. Nitti. The second interpretation he used, however, in his official propaganda abroad and especially in the United States, where the popularity of Italy arising from the first interpretation was capitalized as a foundation of goodwill for insinuating the second. While people the world over were working for the consolidation of "Wilsonism"—a war effort consciously directed at producing revolution in Germany—Mr. Ferrero's office in New York was lecturing, to the small audiences that would listen, on the Pact of London and the racial superiority of Italy, flirting with the Republican opposition in this country, circulating Mr. Roosevelt and Senator Lodge in Italy as a breakwater against the rising Wilson tide, and representing the League of Nations as a vaporous ideal. Thus we come down to August and September, 1918. The Italians won in June in the great battle on Montello and the Piave, losing therewith at least half the Wilsonism they had acquired at Caporetto, waiting, to shed the rest, for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French, English, and American victories in France in the next two months. We say "the Italians"; but it is necessary to distinguish between the millions of people in Italy who were lifting their eyes in adoration to Mr. Wilson's vision of a new world, and the hundreds of politicians, diplomats, intellectuals, and journalists whom the pressure of war necessities had left in charge of Italian foreign policy.

Meanwhile, conditions were developing in which Mr. Orlando's straddle between Wilsonism and perdition could no longer endure. As a result of a misunderstanding between the American State Department and Mr. Creel's committee—a misunderstanding which it is not essential to go into—the impression got abroad that Mr. Wilson, mum on the Pact of London, was propagandizing in Italy for the Pact of Rome. Mr. Orlando was still in position to jump either way. He thought it best before doing anything to go unofficially before the country through the press. He lifted the censorship on discussion of foreign policy and inspired the then famous polemic of September, 1918, which aimed, for the information of the Government, to test the state of public opinion on the question of possible Italian "renunciations" in the Adriatic.

This polemic served to crystallize two currents of opinion in the constitutional parties in Italy, which in turn provoked the Cabinet crisis of December. Mr. Orlando found that he had only a fair chance to maintain his leadership on a basis of Wilsonism (for on that platform he could count with security only on the socialists, the radicals, and certain democratic and liberal groups); whereas he could retain an unquestioned majority of conservatives and liberals by "standing pat." There has never been any way of testing the exact balance of political forces in Italy at that time. Estimates vary according to sources. It is accurate only to state that much depended at the moment on Mr. Wilson, on his ability to deal with the opposition in the United States, on his chances of winning at the Peace Conference. The official Italian view was frank. In the general reconstruction of Europe along the proposed lines, Italy would align herself with Mr. Wilson cordially and sincerely. In a stand-pat Europe, Italy would look out for her own interests. She would not, however, assume a position of leadership, but rather that of "watchful waiting." Meanwhile it was patent to everyone that Mr. Wilson could not win at Paris without Mr. Orlando's support. The blame may be placed anywhere you wish on the circumference of this vicious circle. Mr. Wilson might have compelled Mr. Orlando's support by using any one of the various instruments of pressure which he had in his hands between October, 1917, and November, 1918. On the other hand, Mr. Orlando's title to a medal for distinguished ineptitude rests on the fact that he was blind (where Giolitti was clear-sighted) to Italy's complete isolation in Entente diplomacy, blind also largely from dust that he had raised himself.

Mr. Orlando went to Paris with the Pact of London and the agreement of San Giovanni di Mauriana snugly tucked in his vest pocket, relying on the "sense of honor" of Lloyd George and Clemenceau to give validity to those documents—and the famous four-handed game of bridge began. Mr. Wilson, in the rôle of dummy, lays his cards on the table, that well-remembered string of deuces furnished by Messrs. Borah, Lodge, Reed, and Poindexter. Mr. Orlando is in the position of a partner who has made a bargain to divide all winnings with his opponents. He plays the game in accordance with his understanding, we cannot say with Lloyd George and Clemenceau, but rather of Lloyd George and Clemenceau. He is willing that England and France get all they can from Mr. Wilson, in Russia, in Germany, in Africa, in Asia Minor, where you wish. When it comes the turn of Italy to play her cards against Greece, Jugoslavia, the Orient, and Mr. Wilson, could England and France be relied upon to support Mr. Orlando?

The best traditions of Italian diplomatic objectivity would have held, and truly held, that there is nobody in Europe, outside of Italy, who is particularly interested in seeing Italy as a Great Power; nor would those same traditions have relied too strongly on mere "points of honor." England and France could well afford to accept a charge of treason which in all its specifications betrays violations of the spirit, if not of the letter of the Fourteen Points. Mr. Federzoni may truly rage that the justice which Mr. Wilson failed to inaugurate along the Rhine, in China, Africa, and Russia, he cannot hope to recover in the Adriatic. The plain result of the Paris strategy had been to force Mr. Orlando, before world opinion, into affirming that the injustice which had triumphed elsewhere must triumph also in the case of the Italian claims.

To gauge the magnitude of the Italian defeat in the policy of playing France and England against Wilson, we need quote only some bitter Italian words. They are those of Mr. Goffredo Bellonci. He says in the *Resto del Carlino*,

> Italy comes out of the Paris Conference, stripped and impoverished, for the frontiers, pushed up to the Brenner, and the acquisition of Trent, Trieste, and Pola, which would have represented a real gain for Italy in the balance of power system of 1914, assure her no political or economic advantages today. France, with the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, with the possession of the Saar basin, with the control of Syria and the extension of her already vast colonial dominions, is acquiring outlets, markets, and raw materials that put her in the front rank of industrial powers. But this is not enough for France. She is bent on depriving Germany and Italy of markets and outlets. All those who have followed French policy in Poland, Bohemia, and Austria know how France is encircling Germany. But a few words are necessary to show how she is stifling us. In the West, France is consolidating her frontiers, from Savoy, which is to lose its neutrality, to the Pyrenees, where the French are taking Catalonia under their protection. In the East, France is creating a Danubian and Baltic league, strengthening Serbia and Greece in order to prevent our expansion in the Adriatic and Mediterranean. The principle of nationality is being used to deprive us of the Dodecanese and to give Smyrna to Greece. The principle of economic freedom is sufficient to contest our claim to Fiume, which is the outlet of the new Central European federation into the Adriatic. She denies us the mining regions of Heraclea but asks for herself the protectorate over the Turkish triangle comprising Broussa, Angora, and Kostamouni. With Fiume we lose the trade route of the East and with Smyrna a terminal for lines out of Trieste. We are granted a caravan route in Lybia through Daibat, Ghadames, and Ghat, since France is to hold the railroad of the Kamerun which gives her control of Tchad. But we fail to get Djbouti, which is indispensable to our colonization in East Africa. When we have been deceived in the matter of Asia, Africa, the Adriatic, and the Mediterranean, why should we try to hide the evidences of our complete diplomatic defeat?

Why, indeed? But why also was it necessary to mob Mr. Bissolati for outlining the only policy that could lead Italy to a position of dignity and glory in Europe? Or why stone Mr. Giolitti for insisting that if a nation is to be Machiavellian, the first duty of that nation is to be Machiavellian with a vengeance?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have called Mr. Orlando's policy "idealistic." We must explain that term. The "ideal" that has deprived that policy of all foresight is the "ideal" of the great European Power, dependent for its security, not upon an "organized mankind," but upon resources of physical power "snitched" by this device or that from weaker or defenceless nations. And this "ideal" can, for Italy, be transferred into "reality" only by a show of power which she cannot develop in herself, but which she must borrow from without. Hence the cry of treason against France and England (and even against Wilson). Those Powers, in the emergency of consolidating their own international position, have refused to make the loan. As it is, Mr. Orlando has nothing to show for his desertion of Wilson. Having lacked the courage to seize the leadership of democracy in Europe, Italy must go on contentedly or discontentedly bringing up the rear of the imperialistic procession.

Will Mr. Nitti or Mr. Giolitti be the man to scrape back into the pot the beans that Mr. Orlando has spilled? No one is particularly alarmed by the threat of the Giolittians to patch up the remaining fragments of the old Triple Alliance. Everyone is interested in seeing what Mr. Nitti can do with the surviving fragments of Wilsonism. But at any event it is to be hoped that the fall of Mr. Orlando's Cabinet may mark the end of an orgy of nationalistic emotionalism in Italian foreign policy which has threatened to turn the "heiress of Greece and Rome" into the largest, simply, of the Balkan states.

Foreign Correspondence

Paving the Road to Revolution

Paris, June 7

A GOOD many thoughtful persons in Paris are wondering whether or not the long-predicted revolution has perhaps arrived, or, if it has not, how long its coming can be delayed. For a week Paris has been suffering under a strike. The ordinary transportation service of the city and its suburbs has for the most part been suspended. The two subway systems, almost completely tied up for two days, are even now able to maintain only an infrequent service with shortened hours, and only a few trams and omnibuses are running. A strike in one of the largest of the department stores has been settled, as have strikes in a few other industries; but the metal workers, comprising numerous trades, and numbering, according to one estimate, more than 200,000 persons, together with a considerable list of other workers, are still out, and negotiations for a settlement appear to make little progress. In the Pas-de-Calais, in northern France, the coal miners, who also struck, have had their grievances adjusted, but strikes small and large are reported from all parts of the country, and we shall soon know whether the threatened adherence of the railway employees is to give to the movement a nation-wide character. Meantime Paris walks to and from its work, or jams to suffocation the few subway trains or surface trams or 'buses which the companies contrive to operate.

The immediate occasion of the strikes is, as usual, a dispute over wages and hours and conditions of employment, the details of which, for the most part, are of significance mainly for France. Broadly speaking, the controversy has to do either with the arrangements for putting into operation the new eight-hour day which has just come into effect, or with the frank demand for higher wages due to the continued rise in the cost of living. Neither the Government nor the employers appear to have made sufficient preparation for the transition to the day of eight hours, and some of the complaints of the workers are of long standing. With the exception of the metal workers, who are demanding a forty-four hour week in addition to increased wages, it is not clear that the demands of the strikers are either irregular or excessive, or that the pending issues are in any case such as might not easily have been settled long ago had either the employers or the Government been so disposed. The fact that the demands of the striking miners in the Pas-de-Calais were settled in a few days shows that the machinery of industrial adjustment can move quickly when there is a will behind it.

One would of course be quite unwarranted in assuming that the several hundred thousand men and women who are on strike in France at this moment are pondering deeply the political or economic problems of the country, or the kind of political action which will most effectually redress their grievances. Most of them are probably thinking chiefly about the price of bread, the soaring cost of milk and meat and fruit, the extreme scarcity of sugar, and the most immediate method of getting more francs for their daily labor. But they are thinking of public matters, too, as anyone who mixed with the crowds of strikers and their families the past few days at the Bois de Boulougne or the Bois de Vincennes, or listened to their talk on the streets or in the restaurants or cafés, or read the newspapers which the workers read, could not fail to perceive. Working-class France is in ferment. While the war was going on for the defence of France and the overthrow of the Germans, the French soldier was the subject of many fine words and the recipient of many hopeful assurances. He was encouraged to look forward to a time when France, free from the German menace and German trade competition, would enter upon a new era of prosperity and plenty. In particular, he was given very concrete promises that the indemnities to be exacted from Germany would go a long way toward paying the cost of the war and lightening the burden of after-the-war taxes. So he fought on, until the German menace had disappeared.

And now what does he find? Almost every article of personal or family consumption continues appallingly high. Food prices are steadily rising, although there is no alarming lack of food in the country. For weeks sugar has been almost unobtainable, although there is sugar enough in France to afford the population everywhere a modest supply. A reputable Paris paper tells of tons of vegetables and fruits held in railway wagons outside the city until they spoiled, in order to keep up the price in the Paris markets. The outlook for coal next winter is alarming, while instead of lower taxes the Government holds out only the assurance of new and heavier ones. To cap the climax, it is now generally known that the Government is in a dilemma regarding the indemnities. If the amount of indemnity is left undetermined, as at present, in the treaty with Germany, not only will it be a confession that the amount actually to be obtained is much less than France was deliberately led to expect, but it will also tend to impair the borrowing power of France abroad. In either case, the Government is in a poor position to meet an interpellation. Working-class France, in short, confronted with a problem

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BEREA, OHIO

of daily living that is constantly getting more acute, feels that it has been deceived by a bourgeois Government, that it is being exploited by bourgeois profiteers, and that there is no relief save by the establishment of the democracy which Mr. Wilson has preached in words that are remembered, but upon the practice of which he and his associates appear to have turned their backs.

What is the answer of the Clemenceau Government to this working-class ferment? Today, squads of cavalry, fully equipped and carrying machine guns, have been coming into Paris, marching ostentatiously along the boulevards, down the Rue Royale, and across the Place de la Concorde. Yesterday, it is reported, a regiment of infantry was quietly brought into the city. The subway stations are guarded by police and soldiers, and there are soldiers on some of the omnibuses and tramcars. There has been a little disorder in the suburbs, but on the whole the strike leaders have succeeded in preventing serious disturbance. Will the troops obey orders if worse comes to worst? The reported revolt of three regiments at Toulouse early in the week is disquieting, as are the reports of conditions in the Black Sea and Mediterranean fleets. The Government policy of repression continues. Today the issue of *L'Humanité* was seized; yesterday the censor tore to bits an editorial in the Paris edition of the *New York Herald*. On Thursday the residence of M. Schoeller, business manager of the *Matin*, was searched by the police on a charge of alleged misuse of his office as secretary general of the *Office Nationale de la Presse*, an organization representing the press of France, with the result of calling out from the committee of the organization a vigorous protest, and a demand that they all be proceeded against along with M. Schoeller.

The step is not long to the dilly-dallying of the Peace Conference, the treatment of Russia, and the Italian plan for a general European strike. It is significant that the same recent issue of *L'Humanité*, the Socialist organ, in which M. Marcel Cachin asks if "these social agitations which henceforth are becoming more and more chronic" are not "a sign of the revolutionary condition which does not cease to grow in our country as in all Europe," should print also a stirring appeal of the French Socialists against intervention in Russia; that the conservative papers, including those of London, should be at pains to minimize the importance of every reference to Russia in the current popular manifestos; or that the powerful Confédération Générale du Travail should ask, in a public proclamation on the strike, "Is it the workers who are responsible for the slow progress toward the conclusion of peace? Are they responsible for the ignorance in which the sovereign people is kept?" Two severe arraignments of the German treaty, issued by the *Alliance Universitaire Française*, and carrying the names of some of the most eminent scholars and university men of France, have appeared in huge poster form this week and have drawn crowds of readers. I do not wish to overemphasize any of these incidents, for I am well aware that the views of a few leaders are not necessarily those of the masses. What I am clear about is that France at this moment is in unstable equilibrium, and that no extraordinary force would be needed to upset the existing political order of things. Perhaps the needed impetus will come in France, as it has more than once come elsewhere, not from any deliberate act of the people, but from some crowning foolishness of the Government itself.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

A Receivership for Civilization

By LINCOLN COLCORD

Washington, June 21

THERE must be many promising Washington stories thrown into the waste basket these nights by news editors, after anxious consultation with their respective sources of policy and authority. The real story of political developments in the national capital during the past week so far exceeds the news that has been given us, that someone must have sweat blood to keep it out of the public eye. I refuse to believe that our Washington correspondents have not found this story, for, as the saying goes, it has to be kicked aside in order to get into the Senate corridors; but it is more likely that, drawing a lesson from sad experience, they simply have not bothered to write it up at all. At any rate, it would be hard to find a better instance of the failure of the system-controlled press to report the news of the day. The American people had less and less of the truth from Washington in their newspapers with every month that the war progressed; and now that the war is over and we are approaching the aftermath of social and economic reconstruction, the public may rest assured that practically nothing will be reported either fully or in its right phase.

The story I have in mind is the story of the Knox resolution and the Republican opposition to the League of Nations, with special reference to the interests of the international bankers in the League and to the campaign which they are waging throughout the country for its support. It is the story of how, almost for the first time during the present Wilson Administration, the Republican party seemed on the point of taking up a liberal, effective, and constructive opposition; and of how that policy, before it has become fixed upon the party, stands in grave danger of being abandoned through the influence of powerful reactionary forces within the ranks. In short, the incident of the peace-treaty leak in Wall Street has precipitated the clash between the progressives and the Old Guard in the Republican Party which normally would have been reserved for the fight over freedom of speech and a peace-time espionage law; and the sudden onslaught of Senator Knox, his apparent defection to the ranks of the independents, has thrown consternation into the camp of the reactionaries. For two weeks, progressive circles in Washington have been boiling with indignation at the machinations of the international bankers in Paris, although scarcely a word of it has got into the newspapers; and the agitation against the League of Nations, based on sound sense and true Americanism, and strongly supported by the development of events from day to day, has been making tremendous headway. The Republican party was rapidly being lined up on a programme of healthy, brave, and cogent opposition.

Last Sunday, as is now common knowledge in Washington, there was an important meeting of Senators which virtually amounted to a Republican caucus. The meeting had been called to permit Senator Knox to explain his position. The country would be interested to know, and should know, that Senator Knox at this meeting denounced the international bankers at Paris in unmeasured terms, accused them of being the chief promoters of the League of Nations, and flatly refused to subscribe to any such arrangement as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they were planning to foist upon the world. If report is to be credited, his argument ran something as follows:

Some of you gentlemen [referring to the progressive Senators] have expressed it as your opinion that the League of Nations is being set up in Paris by the international bankers, in order that they may control the world through its machinery. Now, this is not a matter of opinion with me—I *know*. They are planning to set up a receivership for civilization, and to use the wealth and power of the United States to maintain all the bonded obligations of Europe, and to crush out opposition to their plans by the combined force of arms and of organized opinion throughout the world. As an American citizen, with some knowledge of our history and traditions, with some love for my country, and with some understanding of what this arrangement will mean for future generations, I feel compelled to protest against it to the limit of my power. In my resolution I merely am asking for time—for time to get the real news out to the country, and to let the country think it over. I do not believe that America, if it knew the facts, would support the League of Nations as it is at present constituted.

After this dramatic statement, it is reported that other Senators, men like New and Frelinghuysen and Brandegee, who have never been classed among the progressive Republicans, spoke to the same point and took the same position. "I have always been a conservative," said one, "but this deal is too raw for me. I can't sit silent and see my country handed over as a tool for the international bankers—not when I realize that the American boys of the future will have to go abroad to fight their dirty wars!" "I come from an industrial State," said another, "where the international bankers have a great deal of power. Let me tell you how they are trying to get me, on account of what I have said already in the Senate." And he told of three attempts that had been made through banking channels to influence his position on the League of Nations during the previous two weeks. Said a third:

Yes, they are using all their power to their end. A couple of weeks ago I was talking about the League of Nations with one of the most prominent bankers in Chicago—he isn't what you would call an international banker. We agreed that the whole idea, as it stands at present, was an outrage against America, against democracy, and against the people of the world; that it was nothing but a scheme to use the free wealth and fresh energies of the United States to support the vast bonded obligations of these international financiers, regardless of the interests of the nations and populations involved; that it promised an era of revolt and bloodshed such as the world never saw; and that no brave and honest man could subscribe to the undertaking. Yesterday I had a long letter from this same banker, reversing his position; Mr. Davison had been to Chicago in the meanwhile, you see. My friend now feels that the League of Nations is not perfect, but that we must make the best of it; that there must be some machinery of super-government set up, in order to stabilize world conditions and securities, and all that sort of thing.

These are the thoughts that Republican Senators of independent mind are uttering. They are paying close attention to their mail—and their mail is quite surprising. It shows that the "plain people" of the country are very anxious about the League of Nations; if it is a good thing, they want to support it; but lacking any real information, and not yet having had time to thresh the problem out, they are full of a vague distrust of the proposal. They are beginning to be afraid that something is being "put over" on them. The South seems to be quite as much opposed to the idea as is the North. A letter to a Republican Senator from a professional man, a Democrat, in Atlanta, Georgia, is typical of the word that the country is sending to Washington. The letter runs thus:

I can assure you that the people of this region are against the League of Nations. They don't understand it, and are alarmed at the course the country is taking at Paris. But the people are not vocal, and all our expressed opinion runs the other way. Our leaders are shouting for Wilson and the League of Nations, our prominent citizens get their tip from the banks, and our newspapers won't even publish candid letters of protest or inquiry. Thus a policy may be adopted which actually does not have the support of the country, and against which the people are bound to turn as soon as they fully awake up to what has been done.

The position of Senator Knox in all this is deserving of great credit. Senator Knox has always been a conservative; and, from the liberal standpoint, it is easy enough to attribute ulterior motives to a man with a conservative record. But when radicals and conservatives learn to be fair to each other, the millenium will have come. After talking with Senator Knox at some length, and after talking with many other Senators about him, I am convinced that his position is a brave and sincere one, that he means what he says, and that he is going to fight to the finish.

The brunt of the drive to force the party into outright opposition to the League of Nations will of course fall upon Senators Johnson and Borah. They believe that the power and freedom of America are being sold out by the international bankers for the sake of saving vast investments in the bonds of European Governments, that American youth is being cheerfully consigned to an era of imperialism and world-wide war, that the League of Nations is nothing but the machine by which these men hope to rule the world in the interests of financial autocracy, that the bankers are the chief influence behind the League at Paris, that they are at the same time helping to keep America in such a state of ignorance and reaction that the scheme can be railroaded through the Senate and fixed upon the country, and that, to cap it all, they are making enormous profits out of the existing enterprise and will make enormous profits out of the enterprise to come. Peace or war, it would be six of one and half a dozen of the other for the international bankers under the League of Nations. The progressives recognize that the test has come; if the Republican Party cannot become the liberal party of the future, if at this critical pass it is only to fall supinely into the arms of the Old Guard, then its days are numbered, and the day of the birth of the third party is at hand. Said Senator Borah to me with a bitter cynicism that would give any American citizen pause:

We stand a chance unless the international bankers can buy us out. The country doesn't want the League of Nations that they have arranged—I know that—and if we could get the truth out to the country, it would want the League still less. But they have a perfectly inconceivable control of leadership and opinion. The country imagines that it is thinking its own thoughts, and doesn't dream that it is being bamboozled. So the pressure will be brought to bear in the Senate, and a lot of men will change their minds.

Senator Johnson outlined to me with equal cynicism the tactics that the international banking forces will follow:

They will try to get us to ratify the treaty and the League with a few reservations. When the voting is over, the reservations will be forgotten. It would be just as fatal to the future peace and happiness of America if we ratify with reservations, as if we ratified hands down. Nothing but a complete change in the spirit and construction of the League would free the world from the menace of financial autocracy. LINCOLN COLCORD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Summer of Peace

By LEONORA SPEYER

SUMMER comes to the stricken earth,
Lays gentle fingers of bud and leaf
On broken hedge and field's wide dearth,
And the great hills' rocky grief;
Brings her comfort of May and June,
Pours on red wounds the blackbird's tune,
Bids with her tender, imperious green
Anger and vengeance and fevered hate
Abate!

Deep in my heart is a faded pain—
None knows—
Summer, put there a rose
Red as its one-time scar!
Bid it flame to a grief again,
Bid it sing like the morning star—
Shining song of a fresh, young woe
That none shall know—
Spread there the blossoms of splendid regret,
I do not want to forget!

In the Driftway

MIDSUMMERNIGHT may have been marked by rejoicing in Silesia, now that there is to be a plébiscite instead of a hand-over. Was it perhaps like one which the Drifter enjoyed years ago in Silesia? It was Lower Silesia, it happens, but what does it matter? (Not many months ago a friend of the Drifter's was breakfasting with Mr. Lloyd George, when mention was made of Silesia. "By the way," said the distributor of imperial largess, "is it Upper or Lower Silesia we are giving away?") Schneekoppe, king of the Riesengebirge—those Giant Mountains—stretched its snowy ridge like a long bridge-of-the-gods across the heavens, where the Drifter looked to see majestic shapes move to and fro on this one night of all the year. The nearer hills were the realm of lesser spirits, for this is the land of Rübezahl, the mountain sprite. In the stillness of the white evening, the Drifter, pack on back, sauntered along the solitary valley road till he came to an old, old inn, open but apparently deserted. "Zum Rübezahl" was dimly written on the swinging sign. There was a hush as if the countryside were taking a long breath before its great moment. Then upon a distant hill-top a fire suddenly leaped into being, and its kinsman spoke back in dancing flame from a nearer summit; another quickened and another. Down by the river another blazing beacon drew the Drifter as with *Feuerzauber*. All the meadow was lighted and black against it were leaping figures dancing and circling round the sparkling pile. The spirits of earth had taken shape, and for the night Rübezahl and his crew were fused with mortal men. . . . If the plébiscite should be taken on Midsummernight the gods of the Silesian homeland would prevail.

* * * * *

COUNT BROCKDORFF-RANTZAU, who was for so long victorious in many minor engagements with the Allied forces of diplomacy, is merely following the family tradition. For one of his ancestors, Count Josias Rantzau, was a Marshal of France and, according to the gossip of the day, was closely allied to the throne. This early Rantzau was originally a man of many parts, and a walking monument to an equal number of lost causes. When he died he was possessed of one leg, one arm, one ear, and one eye. The rest was gone in battle for his adopted country. With graceful phrase his contemporaries chronicled this record on his grave. After an enumeration of his physical losses on the field of honor, the epitaph concludes: "Mars left this hero nothing whole but his heart." The descendant of such a man must be a dangerous character.

* * * * *

IN the subway the Drifter could not avoid the reprehensible crime of reading the next man's paper (it was of course his first offence). This is what caught his eye: " . . . Georges Clemenceau, whose masts were stripped and whose hulk was wallowing dangerously in the trough of a heavy sea. Three men were clinging to what was left of the rigging"—and that was as far as the Drifter got. This seemed a strangely nautical metaphor, yet suggestive and prophetic. The Drifter could imagine how Boardman Robinson would work that into a cartoon, with the three desperate Old Men clinging to the Tiger's tattered rigging. But just then the newspaper moved back into the line of vision, and the Drifter found that the paragraph referred to an actual, and not a diplomatic, shipwreck, and that the Georges Clemenceau mentioned was a three-masted fishing barkentine.

* * * * *

THE Drifter wanted some personal information about a young man who had applied for a position, and went to an old friend for enlightenment. After he had obtained the necessary details he asked a final question: "Tell me," he said, "what is the political religion of this young man?" The answer was entirely satisfactory: "Oh, his religion—why, it is liberalism tempered by a wife and three babies."

* * * * *

THE Drifter glanced in at the editor's sanctum. "Cleaning house or moving?" he asked. The editor smiled and continued to pile his desk with neat folders. "Raids," he replied, "are the order of the hour. It occurred to me that in case anyone drives up to our door with a truck, it will be the chance of a lifetime to get rid of all these dead articles and out-of-date reviews, and the ten thousand superfluous letters-to-the-editor that we never have room for." "Superb!" cried the literary editor, who had dropped in, "I can contribute two-and-a-half tons of books that we can't review." "And I," said the International editor, "should be glad if the raiders would denude my walls. Maps don't last over night any more. We need a movie outfit to keep us up to the minute in states and boundaries." "Gentlemen," said the Drifter, "I fear you are indulging false hopes. I noticed the circulation manager letting out sail as I came by—but I fear you are all doomed to disappointment. What if there should be no raid?" The expectant faces fell. "But just in case there should be," said the Drifter indulgently, "remember the instructions they gave me in Mongolia: 'When the bandits come, put away your gun and get out your tea-kettle.'" If *The Nation* had only acquired the cheering habits of its English contemporaries it would be thoroughly equipped for such an emergency. Perhaps some enthusiastic reader will fortify the office with a samovar.

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

The Stone on Top of the Hill

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The following paragraph from a letter just received from Norman Angell should be of interest to readers of *The Nation*.

New York, June 30 H. S.

"As to things in England: just now they are in a general way what they appear to be the world over. Everybody is deadly tired—tired of the War, tired of the Peace; tired with the Huns, tired with themselves; tired with Capital but equally tired with Labour; and I think for a time we shall have just an organized indulgence of the senses. There is a minority in Labour very revolutionary in temper. Whether anything will come of their efforts will depend entirely on accidental circumstances. It is the case of a stone on the top of a hill sending the current one way or the other. Stranger things than the appearance of a Soviet Government in England have happened during the last year or two. If it came, of course, it wouldn't be called the Soviet Government, but it might well *be* that. In fact I am disposed sometimes to think that is precisely what will happen. We shall have a new Coalition Ministry, the Coalition this time including representatives not alone of the parliamentary forces but also of the industrial forces. Trades Unionists will be taken into the Government as Trades Unionists and not as members of the political machine. Thus will begin the new chapter. But all calculations may be upset by the outbreak of a pestilence in Europe this year. Conditions physically in the Central Empire and Russia are beyond all belief; famine and disease may play Old Harry."

Thursday

"For of Such"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: When adults fail let children take on responsibility!

The teacher of the grade above mine told me that her "bad Johnnie" was getting so much better—"he's my best boy now. Why, he brought me $3.50 for the savings stamp drive." I knew the family: a sick grandmother, and a widowed mother working overtime until midnight, in a factory. Unthinkingly I blurted out, "I'm sorry—Johnny must have stolen it." Then I stopped, realizing that the best teacher is the one who collects the most money for the Liberty or Victory drive of the moment and the best child is the baby of seven or eight who hands over the most dollars.

Today another teacher said, "That kindergarten substitute teacher feels awfully worried because not a child in her class has bought a bond this term. It isn't strange, for the older children have had to give so much money. She hasn't been able to buy a bond herself yet because she's only been paid $60 in two months."

A nurse from another school said, "They told me Angelina was staying out. I found her at home cowering in that awful tenement." (I knew it, over by the docks). "She said the teacher had told her not to dare to show her face until she brought that forty-eight cents for the drive. Why, there are six children, and the father is feeble-minded, and there wasn't fifty cents in the place."

Yesterday in the rain I stopped to see my favorite family. The father is a magnificent American specimen, a skilled shipbuilder, but one arm is crushed and splinters of bone suppurate out at intervals. Now he is able to work only one or two weeks out of every month at $18 a week piece work. The workmen's compensation was paid in a lump sum four years ago and did not cover the expense of two years' illness. The mother had to go to work in a munition factory last year. Now she works at something else for $10 to $12 a week. Their standard of living has dropped terribly. I found little nine-year-old Mary crying under the table with a note to the mother which said in effect, "Mary tells me you and your husband both work so I am sure you can save $50 for a bond. I am sure you are patriotic." The mother said, "She dassent go to school because all the children that don't pay are made a mock of. But never mind, dear, you know teacher likes you and says how smart you are, and I'll write a note and tell how it is with us. Why, both of us got bonds last summer, but I had influenza and his arm's been bad again, and I don't get good wages like I did last summer anyway."

A principal of my acquaintance said, "Yes, that is an interesting experiment in education you are suggesting, but I can't do anything about it now. We are all taken up with problems of finance—teachers and children, too. I hear that Public School No. X has raised $80,000." Another school head said to me, "You and I don't believe in this sort of thing, even though we are not Marxian socialists. I tell you this country is going to pay for what it is doing to the children."

Is it not time that something was done to stop this sinister persecution of children?

New York, June 21 A. N. N.

Colonial Methods

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of June 14 you print a communication signed Moorfield Storey, in which this gentleman, in discussing the seizure of the German colonies, employs this language: "What you call its (Germany's) colonies are parts of the earth's surface which belong to their inhabitants, whom the Germans overcame by force and have misgoverned with great brutality for the purpose of enriching Germans." Permit me to call the attention of your correspondent to a meeting of the British Colonial Society held at London shortly before the outbreak of the war. At that meeting Professor Bonn of Germany delivered a lecture on German colonial methods, at the end of which the British Colonial Secretary took the floor to pay a glowing tribute to the manner in which Germany had managed her colonies and particularly to the humane treatment accorded the inhabitants thereof. From this historical fact your correspondent may infer how far he has been misled by war literature. As to those colonies "enriching Germans," he is likewise mistaken. They (the colonies) cost the Imperial treasury considerably more than they ever brought in, especially because of the marvellous improvements made wherever Germans set foot on foreign soil. The fact is that all Germany possessed when the war broke out, she had literally earned in the sweat of her brow, and in this she differed materially from her main rivals who, for a century or more, carried wealth from all corners of the earth into their coffers. In conclusion, if it is true what your correspondent asserts that all colonies belong to their inhabitants, there would be nothing left of Great Britain but England and Scotland. Or does he wish to see his own rule applied to Germany alone?

St. Louis, June 18 H. R.

Stepping Heavenward

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: *The Nation* and other progressive journals are full of hopeful signs, if your correspondent, Mr. Henry S. Foote, will but take note of them. Take, as one example, the effort of our churches to effect a reconciliation with the doctrines of Jesus. Our Presbyterian friends are raising ever so many millions in the hope that it will give them a start heavenward. The cynic's remark that "When they are done spending those millions they will discover that the money led them in the wrong direction," has no bearing, because what the cynic considers hell looks like heaven to the Presbyterian.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Methodists are also going strong on the money route, and it is a question of dollars and cents whether they or the Presbyterians will reach the heavenly goal first.

Our Catholic brethren have a reconstruction programme which is a bid for an amicable understanding with their old-time foe, Socialism. Episcopalians are inviting the poor to enter their churches wherever they have no mission near by. These are all hopeful signs of Christian revival.

Pittsburgh, June 24 W. H. NOREN

The Paths of Sympathy

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Friends, commonly called Quakers, have sent hundreds of men and women to France for reconstruction work. They are establishing retail commerce by organizing coöperative stores; they are setting on its feet social service work in all its forms. They have established milk stations for babies, and have made possible several health exhibits each with an attendance running into the hundreds of thousands. Most notable among these was the one at Lyons. Out of eight hundred and seventy-eight babies born in the maternity hospital at Châlons, eight hundred and thirty-eight were born alive, and survived the first month. Of the mothers only two died. In the general hospital at Sermaize, Dr. Babbitt performed over a thousand operations with only seventeen surgical deaths. Records like these are rare, even in the best American hospitals. When it is remembered that many of these mothers were moved into and out of bomb-proofs at critical times, and that the whole population was living on an insufficient and unpalatable diet, the "therapeutic value of love" in this hospital work stands out in vivid contrast against the heartlessness of war.

More men and women than can be sent have volunteered for reconstruction work in France, Serbia, and Russia. The ethical and religious spirit underlying their work has given people deep confidence in the Quakers, and has enabled those working on both sides of the battle line in "Red Russia," to cash large drafts —for scores of thousands of dollars—in current funds during the past year, at a time when practically every other relief mission had withdrawn from Russia, and when money and credit were said to be unobtainable.

The American Friends Service Committee which manages the American office of the Quaker reconstruction work hopes to be able to keep up this kind of work permanently, covering the homeland as well as foreign fields. The enormous and unsuspected illiteracy brought to light by the recently published reports of the army is only one symptom of the vast need in our own rural districts, where people lack hospitals, doctors, churches, and schools.

Candidates for this permanent work might be drawn from colleges and academies, where pupils, instead of being offered travelling scholarships and European fellowships, might be offered a year's constructive work in social service. The work would differ from the field work now provided by the schools of philanthropy in being primarily ethical and constructive. Without waiting for calls for financial aid, the workers would go to the homes of those with whom they could enter into fellowship, and deal with them in a spirit of sympathetic understanding. Unlike the modern social science expert, these Quakers would in a spirit of humility and with a sympathetic human interest, seek solely to help; not to investigate; not to obtain material for a survey.

The results obtained by a few hundred Quaker workers, and the eagerness with which men and women have continued to volunteer since the signing of the armistice, indicate that success in the world reconstruction for which so many churches are planning depends more on providing opportunities for those willing to work, than on raising enormous funds for training and financing armies of professional workers. In planning the reconstruction of the world we must lay plans not only for rebuilding roads and houses and sewers, but also for rebuilding the paths of sympathetic human interest through which the love of humanity may function.

New York, May 10 EDWARD THOMAS

Kosciusko

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your Polish correspondent in an article in *The Nation* of June 7, puts Kosciusko in the company of the great Poles, Sienkiewicz and Thaddeus. Kosciusko was not a Pole, but a Lithuanian by birth, inheritance, and belief. He was born in the village of Merecovscynoj, in the present government of Vilna, in 1746, at a time when Lithuania and Poland were still joined under the union of Lublin. He was all his life a lover of liberty and took, as we know, a glorious part in the winning of the American Revolution. Upon returning to his native country in 1784, he wrote to his friend, General Niesiolovski:

"I pray your Excellency, respecting all which is dear to humankind, that your Excellency will discharge me from a place that is uncomfortable, costly and to this time has produced nought. O these Gaskoni! [This term of ridicule for the Poles is derived from the cadets of Gascon in the time of Louis XIII, who have also given us the English term *gasconnade.*] Now I am free to write about the people of the land. I will say, the country is beautiful and should be given to the Lithuanians, who are active and industrious. But not for the lazy and fools. Allow me to return to Lithuania. Perhaps you will forsake me when you see that I cannot serve you? Who then am I? I can only say that I am none other than a Lithuanian, a friend of yours. . . . The Lord knows anger seizes me when I think that I, being a Lithuanian, must serve the Poles. . . ."

The democrat Kosciusko, the man who was elected a member of the Society of the Cincinnati and received repeated honors from the American Congress, would shudder at the atrocities committed by the Polish junkers against the Jews and his own kin, the Lithuanians—all in the name of liberty and through the invocation of his own glorious record for freedom. To slay and to oppress the Lithuanians in the name of Kosciusko is as hideous a crime as to massacre Jews in the name of Christianity.

The Lithuanians today seek absolute independence. They cannot make common cause with Poland under the Dmowskis and the representatives of the old régime in Russia and Poland. Like Kosciusko, they seek the establishment of a democratic state on the principles of the American Revolution which he so nobly served.

New York, June 20 BENJAMIN GINZBURG

The Queen's Navee

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In some of your recent issues you have had something to say about Jellicoe and the British Navy. Why don't you refer all your critics upon this subject to Gilbert and Sullivan's operetta "H.M.S. Pinafore"?

Groton, Mass., June 15 LAURENCE BROOKS

Contributors to this Issue

CHARLES PATRICK SWEENEY, formerly assistant to the secretary of the War Labor Board, is labor and industrial editor of the Philadelphia *Public Ledger.*

MARIA MORAVSKY is a young Russian essayist whose work has recently appeared in the *Atlantic* and other leading reviews.

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON is professor of Italian in Western University, London, Ontaria, and a member of the staff of the Foreign Press Service.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Salvation By History

The Undying Fire. By H. G. Wells. The Macmillan Company.

H. G. WELLS, having discovered God in "Mr. Britling," and its by-products, has now discovered the Bible in "The Undying Fire"—a fresh, verbose, eloquent version of the Book of Job. That mighty argument he has restated in current terms with astounding cleverness, with knowledge and passion, and with frequent bursts of high-flying, high-flaming imagination. The novel is no mere imitation of the ancient drama; it owes to it rather its form than its substance. In the vast desolation and disillusion of our day Mr. Wells is content, as was the author of Job, to take a folk-tale from an old tradition and to adorn and inspire it with his own interpretation of the endless mystery of pain. Too intent upon his problem to dread petty accusations of indebtedness, he has followed the form of his original very closely. There is a prologue somewhere in upper space where God once more gives Satan permission to test the endurance of a righteous man; there are cycles of disquisition in which the tragic victim, Job Huss, defends himself against the selfish dubitancy of his wife, and the complacent, mechanical theologizing of Sir Eliphaz Burrows, Mr. William Dad, and Mr. Joseph Farr, to say nothing of the pugnacious impudence of Dr. Elihu Barrack; there is the whirlwind Sir Alpheus Mengo, surgeon; there is the voice of God speaking to Job Huss out of the vapors of chloroform while he lies under the healing knife; and there is a final peace, full of miracles of restoration, to bring the victim back to the prosperity of body and spirit out of which God and Satan had plucked him for their experiment.

Only the fable is antique. The language belongs wholly to the elastic, colloquial, experimental generation of which Mr. Wells is the prophet furthest heard. His heaven looks as if "a futurist with a considerable knowledge of modern chemical and physical speculation and some obscure theological animus had repainted the designs of a pre-Raphaelite. . . . The voices of the cherubim and seraphim can be heard crying continually, "Holy, Holy, Holy." Here are found in colloquy God, not bored, as might be looked for in a personage to whose omniscience nothing can ever be novel, but full of lively interest, and "Satan, the Unexpected." "Satan has the compact alertness of habitual travel; he is as definite as a grip-sack, and he brings a flavor of initiative and even bustle upon a scene that would otherwise be one of serene perfection. . . . If God is omnipresent by a calm necessity, Satan is everywhere by an incessant activity. They engage in unending metaphysical differences into which Satan has imported a tone of friendly badinage. They play chess together. . . . The Ruler of the Universe creates the board, the pieces, and the rules; he makes all the moves; he may make as many moves as he likes whenever he likes; his antagonist, however, is permitted to introduce a slight inexplicable inaccuracy into each move, which necessitates further moves in correction. The Creator determines and conceals the aim of the game, and it is never clear whether the purpose of the adversary is to defeat or assist him in his unfathomable project. Apparently the adversary cannot win, but also he cannot lose so long as he can keep the game going. But he is concerned, it would seem, in preventing the development of any reasoned scheme in the game."

In such an idiom the story takes its course. Job Huss, headmaster of the great Woldingstanton School in Norfolk, is overwhelmed with sudden disasters. His private funds are swept away, an assistant master is killed by an explosion in a laboratory, two boys unaccountably die of measles and two more are burned to death, Huss's only son, a member of the Royal Flying Corps, is shot down over the German lines, and Huss himself is afflicted with cancer in a sordid lodging house at Sundering-on-Sea. Hither, to complete his misery, come his friends, Sir Eliphaz and Mr. Dad, governors of Woldingstanton, and Mr. Farr, head of the technical section of the school, whom the two governors propose to advance at once to the headmastership. All three are hard, dogmatic, successful men without vision, scientists without history or philosophy. They croak stale nonsense about the moral order of the universe, its noble purposes, and its undeviating though inscrutable progression to some millennial end. But Huss, with the high, impassioned confidence of a seer and the absolute candor of a man hourly facing death, overwhelms them with his condemnation of the visible world for its wastefulness and incorrigible fecklessness. In this Mr. Wells only strums upon the harp he has played from the first. And he strikes no new note when, Sir Eliphaz and Mr. Dad having sought refuge in the notion of a future life which shall redress the dishonorable balance of this, Huss argues that mortal men survive in nothing but the immortality of Man. The contribution of the book to the long gallery of Mr. Wells's ideas comes out in the debate between Huss and Dr. Barrack, a glib agnostic Elihu who takes issue with all present. To him Huss propounds the doctrine of the undying fire (the God of Mr. Britling in a slightly more human dress) which animates the minds of just men in every generation, sustaining them through the long darkness of Nature, stumbling and only finding its eyes after so long a struggle toward the light, and yet ceaseless, immortal, divine if you like to use an old term, the one incalculable good, the one indispensable hope of mankind. Science has never learned the secrets of that fire, but history has records of it, and now that science, which might have saved the human world, has instead almost wiped it out of existence by the war, history must guide us to an endurable path. Theology did not save us; science has not saved us. We must seek salvation by history—the history which will reveal to us some veritable tendency in human affairs around which a collective will can be organized to hasten and fulfill it. No longer—and again the earlier Mr. Wells speaks—must blind forces compete for a blind mastery of mankind. We poor pawns on the chessboard of God, having by Him been allowed to suspect some of the rules of His cosmic sport, must now take a hand in it to reduce the "inexplicable inaccuracy" which the Adversary, the Unexpected, constantly brings in to confuse the game. We must help God against Satan in the light of our own past.

Salvation by history! To enough of Mr. Wells's admirers, as to Huss's friends at Sunderling-on-Sea, this will seem mystification, a further loss of faith in pure reason, another flare from the mystical illumination in which Mr. Wells has been sitting, like Job among his ashes, ever since the war fell upon us and God dawned upon Mr. Wells. The ideas of all imaginative writers can be reduced to such simple terms, even those of Mr. Wells, that we wonder how they ever seemed so magical before analysis snipped off their curves and colors. The curves and colors, however, of "The Undying Fire" are its triumphs, not its ideas—which any thoughtful man can have for a few hours' thinking. But the swiftness, the energy, the serried tumult of vivid images, the easy and varied diction, the natural ranging from ironic comedy to the tragedy of profound despair—these no other living English novelist could have achieved. Structurally, the book leaves something to be longed for: the bulky episode of the German submarine, though in itself stirring, does not fit its chapter; the very end of the story, the curtain tableau, is out of tone, fit rather for the deceptively conclusive last page of a common novel than for a grave and lofty argument. Only in this ending does Mr. Wells appear to have lost sight of his model. Without paralleling every turn and shift of the dialectic in the Book of Job, he has nevertheless rendered into our vernacular its chief dramatic moments, catching and throwing into high relief the ignoble qualities of the counsellors and the grand agony and spiritual purgation of Job. Himself not a great poet, Mr. Wells has displayed the peculiar merit of a great translator, adapting himself with feminine flexibility to his borrowed theme and yet reproducing it in an idiom as genuine as his skin. Translation, adaptation as "The Undying Fire" is, it has also a solid wealth of significance in its own right.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Princeton Massinger

The Duke of Milan. By Philip Massinger. Edited by Thomas W. Baldwin. Princeton University Dissertation.

The Fatal Dowry. By Philip Massinger and Nathaniel Field. Edited by C. L. Lockert. Princeton University Dissertation.

THE Graduate School in English at Princeton could hardly perform a better service in the cause of scholarship than to do for Massinger what Yale has for many years been doing for Ben Jonson. It is greatly to be hoped that the two plays now published are the first instalments of a series of dissertations that will ultimately include the entire *corpus* of Massinger's plays and that will lay the foundations for a scientific and definitive edition. For the most recent complete edition (Cunningham's), besides being now hard to come by, is, despite its occasional emendations, a mere reprint of Gifford's. The obvious difficulty in the way of such an undertaking is the lack of funds; the publication of even the Variorum edition of Beaumont and Fletcher has apparently been halted, for no new volume has appeared since 1912. Perhaps the appearance of these two dissertations may call the attention of some wealthy lover of our older literature to this real need. It would be well to decide at once upon a standardized binding and title-page. The plays do not suffer, as do some of the Jonson series issued at Yale, from over-annotation; even so, some notes (for example, "The Fatal Dowry," IV, i, 3) might have been omitted without much loss.

"The Duke of Milan" presents no problem of authorship, it being Massinger's unaided production. The question of sources, while interesting, is not complex, and Professor Baldwin's examination leads to no new conclusion. Josephus remains the chief source, while for the extravagant poisoning scene in the last act Massinger borrowed from "The Second Maiden's Tragedy." Unlike some critics, the editor believes that Massinger, while not slavishly imitating it, received some suggestions from "Othello." The discussion of the date of the play indicates that "The Duke of Milan" was composed and performed towards the close of 1621 or early in 1622. No notice is taken of the fact that the publication of Markham's and Sampson's "Herod and Antipater" and of the first quarto of "Othello" in 1622 makes the latter year more likely. A defect in this Introduction, as in Professor Lacy's, is the lack of any account of the history of criticism of the play. Thus Professor Baldwin makes no reference to Sir Leslie Stephen's suggestion that the theme of conjugal fidelity may have been inspired by Charles I and his wife. The date of the piece of course makes this impossible, but it is of some interest in connection with the history of the play and consorts with one of Massinger's best known characteristics, the introduction of political allusions. Professor Baldwin's study of Massinger's technique, of his ethical prepossession, of his style, and of his conception of tragedy (all with special application to "The Duke of Milan") is excellent. To his bibliography should be added Conrad's "Massinger's Herzog von Mailand" (Stuttgart, 1904), and two suggestive articles in the *Academy* (June 21, 1890, and December 19, 1891).

Professor Lockert is unable to shed any light on the origin of the main plot of "The Fatal Dowry"; it remains unknown, with the possibility of some lost Spanish source still uppermost. The theme of the son's redemption of his father's corpse by means of his own captivity is still traced to Valerius Maximus. His conclusion, elaborately and, we think, convincingly substantiated on the basis of æsthetic considerations, metrical tests, and the test of parallel passages, with regard to the division of authorship between Massinger and Field, is new in various particulars, to Field being assigned far more of the play than he is given credit for by some critics. "The Fatal Dowry" presents possibilities for æsthetic and psychological analysis unusual among the dramas of the Jacobean period. In most of them, as Professor Lockert remarks, "he who searches and probes them presently comes to a point beyond which critical inquiry is stopped short with a desperate finality; . . . a few careful perusals exhaust their possibilities and tell us all there is to know of them. But 'The Fatal Dowry' . . . stands almost alone among its contemporaries in sharing with the great creations of Shakespeare the power to open new vistas, to present new aspects, to offer new suggestions, the longer it is studied." This quality Professor Lockert ascribes to the happy result of the combination of the peculiar excellences of the two authors. He takes full advantage of it in his fine "Critical Estimate" of the play; especially noteworthy is his analysis of the characterization of Beaumelle, which, far from deserving the censure of Saintsbury and Swinburne, is shown to be an outline drawing of the sort of woman—a victim of the tragedy of false romanticism in outlook upon life—that was to receive elaborate portraiture in the character of Emma Bovary. The editor's argument in favor of regarding Ford's "The Lady's Trial" as a direct offshoot from "The Fatal Dowry" would have been more interesting had Professor Baldwin mentioned the possibility that in "Love's Sacrifice" Ford may have borrowed from "The Duke of Milan." There is an inevitable comparison, containing nothing that is novel, between "The Fatal Dowry" and Rowe's "The Fair Penitent." The Introduction closes with an interesting study of the latest drama founded upon the old tragedy—Beer-Hofmann's "Der Graf von Charolais," a recent production of the so-called, and rightly so-called, Decadent School of Vienna.

A History of Religions

The History of Religions. By E. Washburn Hopkins. New York: The Macmillan Company.

NO ordinary event in the world of comparative religion is the appearance of so ambitious a book as this "History of Religions" by so ripe a scholar as Professor Hopkins. Those who have worked in the same subject may realize what its preparation has meant. The author has had to compete with specialists not merely in his own department, Sanskrit, but in numerous others. Hours, even days, of labor might be required in tracing the discussion on some disputed point of archæology up to date through obscure society proceedings in many languages, in order to form a conclusion which could be allowed only a sentence of space.

An outstanding characteristic of Mr. Hopkins's method is self-restraint. He is constantly on guard against the dispositions to romance and to generalize, which are obsessions of so many writers upon religions. He is careful not to be misled by those who have read advanced ideas into primitive beliefs, or who have neglected the effect of suggestion upon the minds of pagan tribes that have brushed, however lightly, against Christianity. Not only does he scorn to cater to the fancy of seekers after sublime truth in every savage cult, but he refrains from assisting the mind of the student by succinct yet inaccurate classifications. Religions are here arranged geographically rather than around common ideas, after the manner of Frazer. We are offered a mass of details which, although as select and compact as possible, necessarily remain somewhat confusing, but which may be received as well-winnowed data, inspiring not enthusiasm but confidence.

This is true more especially in respect to the cults of savage races, ancient and modern, which Mr. Hopkins follows into all divisions of the globe, devoting to them about one-fourth of the volume. Qualified inductions are indeed ventured, as, for instance, that "certain religious phenomena are conspicuous in certain environments while not unknown elsewhere, fetichism in Africa, taboo and mana in Polynesia, totemism in North America." In order of treatment, he follows a generally upward trend of ideas, through Africa, Asia (Ainus and Shamans), Polynesia, America, and Europe. Germanic religion he compares unfavorably with Celtic Druidism, though rating it above Slavic ideas. "On the whole," he says, "Teutonic religion combines a crude cult with a crude belief. It lies between the intellectual level of the North and South American Indians, never rising to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

height of the best Mexican and Peruvian ideas, but distinctly surpassing, in some regards, that of the savages of our Northern hemisphere. It shows no deep religious feeling, no ethical system; it has no religious poet or prophet; only tales about gods. It has feasts, not fasts, as a religious expression." If we look upon this as a contemporary emotional judgment, we must remember that it includes our own Low German ancestors, but the author distinguishes these latter as progressive in worshipping gods of peace and trade. Faith in the All-father he ascribes to a reflex from Christianity, and he points out that the northern Walhalla is late. We are reminded that the Prussians (the Baltic Prussian race proper, of Slavic affinity) were heathen as late as the fourteenth century A. D.

When he comes to consider the higher religions, starting with Vedic Hinduism, Mr. Hopkins tersely describes their development and sectarian changes without attempting to quote at length from their sacred writings. The Indian religions are first disposed of, then those of China, Japan, Egypt, Babylon, Zoroaster, Israel, Mohammed, Greece, and Rome, ending with "The Religion of Christ and Christianity."

In spite of, or possibly because of, his own specialization in the religions of India, Mr. Hopkins discusses these religions dispassionately. Even the humanely ethical force of Buddhism fails to move him. As he proceeds further west he broadens his treatment, and manifests certain preferences. Zoroastrianism he appears to admire. He warms up to the monotheistic reformer King Amenhotep IV, of Egypt, and honors the hymn to the Aton by a long quotation. The sun-cult he rates rather above the Osiris ideal as a value in ancient Egyptian religion.

The chapter which stands last before the discussion of Christianity is reserved for pagan Roman religion, to the faults of which our author is a little blind and to its virtues very kind. That it possessed a certain moral austerity above Hellenism may be granted, but it was a gross formalism. In its state establishment it was an outrageous instrument of soldier, capitalist, and oppressor; compared with it as an agency for evil, Moloch worship was of slight efficiency.

In the chapters dealing with Hebraism and Christianity, which seem to be outside of Mr. Hopkins's vocational concerns, he shows a more radical tendency, and loses something of his caution in ascribing derivations. He inclines to depreciate Babylonian influences and to magnify Persian. Large place is allowed for Greek infiltration before and after Christ. His attribution of primitive Christian rites to Mithraic example goes further than will be followed by all of his readers, even by those who are impressed with the ingenuity of the Church in adapting old forms wherever a chance coincidence furnished a point for the purpose. As a climax, he ventures to account for the historic vitality of Christianity, manifest in its power of self-cleansing and self-perpetuation. Setting aside supernatural reasons, this vitality is due, he says, to Christianity's fundamentally blended twofold nature, which (at risk of failing to do his argument justice in a summary) we may state as follows: One element is an intellectual and social morality, based on authority, typified in state religions like those of Israel, Rome, and China, implanted by the personal teachings of Jesus and represented by the "liberal Christianity" of the nineteenth century. The other element is an individualistic and emotional mysticism, essentially unmoral, akin to Mediterranean Nature cults and Hindu sects, propagated by the Christianity which grew up *about* Christ, and exhibited in the monistic mysticism of the twentieth century.

In this analysis, the state ideal is assumed to be the moral power, the teacher of duty to theology. It is a degrading theory and, however true at the beginning, history enables us to rise above it. It neglects a highly important element in Christianity —*the ethics of individualistic altruism, arising from the words* and life of Jesus, grounded in sympathy, typified by an activated Buddhism, and represented in our own as in earlier times by various minority sects or parties. Has a recognition of this element perhaps been avoided by Mr. Hopkins under compulsion of an intellectual and emotional force cognate with recent world events?

A Proconsul's Fruitful Years

Warren Hastings in Bengal, 1772-1774. By M. E. Monckton Jones. New York: Oxford University Press.

THE problem of the English in America was very different from the problem of the English in Asia. In America, the English had to deal with nomad tribes of head-hunters just emerging from the Stone Age. In Asia, they had to deal with a densely settled native population, with a land-tenure, a system of government, complicated methods of trade and commerce, all based on customs and habits of thought unlike anything in England. Queen Elizabeth's original charter of 1600 empowered English merchants to trade in the Far East. King James made their charter perpetual; but it was not till 1633 that the Company obtained a foothold in the province of Arissa at Balasore. At first they were simple traders, but the deliquescence of the Mogul Empire forced them to take obvious measures of self-defense. Soon they obtained political powers. Clive's great victory at Plassey in 1757 assured them a supremacy they never lost again. The power of "John Company" extended westward steadily, but was more and more limited by the home Government, until the Great Mutiny showed the impossibility of a commercial organization attempting to rule an empire.

Mr. M. E. Monckton Jones's "Warren Hastings in Bengal" is the ninth volume in the Oxford Historical and Literary Studies. As such, it is designed for the use of the special student rather than the general reader. It bristles with details, and every chapter is carefully buttressed with extracts from the original documents. To the American reader, the copious use of Indian terms such as *dustuk, pargana, chowkey, gomastah, dadni* may prove somewhat repellent; but it does not take long to master them; and once understood, they save the trouble of translating into inexact English equivalents. With their aid, one can form a clear idea of the difficulties the English merchants had to overcome, and how they failed until a little man of genius showed them how to succeed.

At first the East India Company had only its trading-posts or factories, where native goods were collected for shipment to England. "From England came woollens, broadcloths, velvets, carpets, hardware, metals, guns, furniture and other manufactures to be sold at 'outcry' in Calcutta. The return cargoes consisted of the silk and cotton cloths and muslins, embroideries, shawls of Bengal and northern India, saltpetre from Patna, pepper and other spices, gums and resins, porcelain and tea from China, ivory and precious stones." How these various commodities were collected and paid for makes an interesting chapter in the history of commerce.

Then the Company acquired territory. In 1698 the new settlement which Charnock founded at Didi Kalkateh secured the Zemindari of Calcutta, Sutaluti, and Govindpur, which included 383 villages. At once a thousand and one problems of administration arose clamoring for solution. The first man to arrive at an intelligent understanding of them was Warren Hastings, the great proconsul, whose trial is one of the events of English history. He did not solve the problems at a glance, or by intuition, but by the toilsome and unromantic road of hard work, an infinite capacity for taking pains. He learned the vernaculars, he studied the native, his laws, customs, habits, prejudices. He proved himself to be the indispensable man; and, when his chance came, he instituted reforms which are still the basis of the English administration of India. Most of this foundation work was done in the years 1772 and 1773. The great commercial enterprise whose servant he was stood on the brink of failure. Hastings saved it from failure. He found the English "a source of disease and misery to the country; he turned them into a spring of new life which brought integrity and vigor into its government, humanity into its law courts, freedom into its markets." Apart from the intrusion of the English, the natives were divided among themselves. Hastings gave them unity instead of anarchy. "A firm authority was set up, enemies were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shut out, and, above all, the long-suffering ryot, whose cause Hastings had ever most at heart, learnt that he could work his land unhindered and enjoy a fair share of its fruits, and that the poor as well as the great could get a hearing and receive justice."

The work is enriched by two remarkable portraits, one showing Hastings the reformer about the age of forty and the other the Squire of Daylesford. The first is *dégagé*, smiling, young: the second is old, alert, bearing the impress of greatness. Macaulay's characterization of the outward man is unsurpassed: "A person small and emaciated, yet deriving dignity from a carriage which, while it indicated deference to the court, indicated also habitual self-possession and self-respect, a high and intellectual forehead, a brow pensive but not gloomy, a mouth of inflexible decision, a face pale and worn but serene, on which was written as legibly as under the picture in the council-chamber at Calcutta, *Mens qua in arduis*."

Aspects of Mid-America

Winesburg, Ohio. By Sherwood Anderson. New York: B. W. Huebsch.

The Soul of Ann Rutledge. By Bernie Babcock. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Jimmie Higgins. By Upton Sinclair. New York: Boni and Liveright.

MR. SHERWOOD ANDERSON is one who stands up among the new corn in the black and heavy prairie country of the Great Valley. His desire is to be a real voice of Mid-America. Winesburg, Ohio, is a typical place, like Caxton, Ia., whence came Windy McPherson's son, or Coal Creek, Penn., whence came Beaut McGregor; and George Willard, the reporter for the *Winesburg Eagle*, is reporter also for the whole great central plain. We sympathize with Mr. Anderson and with what he is trying to do. Such work as his is not absolute; one must talk of his aims and desires as well as of his actual feats. Mr. Anderson has always protested against convention; to use his own words, he defies the New Englanders' gods (either of State Street or of Beacon Street) and tries to find honest Mid-American gods. Yet either he never does quite find them or he can never precisely set forth what he has found.

In one respect Mr. Anderson differs from our recollection of him. Of his picture of Caxton, Ia., it was said that "fortunately lacking Mr. McMasters's keen scent and relish for evil, he has given us a truer and sounder picture" than that of Spoon River. It is not probable that Mr. Anderson has acquired a keener scent for evil than in earlier days, but he sees much in Winesburg that the New England gods at least would call evil. It seems probable that Mr. Anderson has given a distorted view of life, that he caricatures even Winesburg, Ohio. Doubtless there as elsewhere young men and young women are restless under the stings of sex, and there as elsewhere there are evasions and perversions of convention.

Another view of Mid-America has appeared of late. New Salem, Ill., before the Civil War, was more primitive than Winesburg or Spoon River, but all three were Mid-American, and should have something in common. Miss Babcock, in "The Soul of Ann Rutledge," has turned her eyes on other evidences than those of greatest attraction to Mr. Anderson; her mind is intent on another of the great impulses of mankind, that of religion, a factor of life even at Winesburg. Religion has always been an important element in the life of the Middle West and Miss Babcock is right in making religion the master force in her episode in the early life of Abraham Lincoln. She presents a sketch which is as unconventionally true in its own way as some of Mr. Anderson's. If we accept Peter Cartwright engulfing the scoffers in the deep black mud, we can also accept young Lincoln listening to the clear voice singing, "I'm a pilgrim, I'm a stranger." To write a story about Lincoln and Ann Rutledge that shall not be an obvious failure is in itself something of a feat. Miss Babcock does more than deserve this negative praise; her picture has positive points of excellence.

This same Mid-America served as an abiding-place for Jimmie Higgins, although he did not stand in the cornfield among the tassels and the ears; he stood before a machine, feeding in little billets of steel. His friends and companions were not Rutledges from South Carolina and McLeans of New York. They have names like Stankiewitch and Schneider, and came originally from places farther off than any State in the Union. Even the motives of life are different; Jimmie Higgins's life is not much influenced by the thought of women or of God; it is dominated by a passion unknown to Abraham Lincoln or George Willard. Yet Leesville and Ironton are obviously Middle-Western, and here and there we see the old swimming-hole and the cornfield that we are used to, and indeed see people who look familiar.

Mr. Sinclair's book is not primarily Mid-American or even American. It is international in its sympathy, and international too in scope and scene. It presents a crowded but living panorama of socialism in America during the last five years. It is in Mr. Sinclair's usual manner, which is a contrast to Mr. Anderson's or Miss Babcock's. Mr. Anderson thinks of his characters as real people; it is hardly an exaggeration to say that he watches them to see what they will do. Miss Babcock, meditating over the figures of the past, more or less clearly known, conceives old incidents again or devises new incidents to fill out gaps in the record. But Mr. Sinclair's mind is filled with the great motives over which he has thought so much. His figures are not exactly types devised to fit each situation; they are something more. But they come and go for the development of the idea, and seem to have little interest in life save that which comes out in their relation to Jimmie Higgins.

Books in Brief

WHETHER or not, says Joseph Edgar Chamberlain in "The Ifs of History" (Altemus), "we believe that events are consciously ordered before their occurrence, we are compelled to admit the importance of contingency in human affairs." As his first illustration of this thesis, he recalls the case of Christopher Columbus, and points out that if, against his judgment, he had not turned south, following a flight of birds to San Salvador, North America would probably today be a Spanish possession. Royal marriages do not count for much nowadays, but if Ethelred the Redeless had not married the Norman Emma, there would most likely have been no Norman Conquest, of which Green says that "it secured for England a new communion with the artistic and intellectual life of the world without her. To it we owe not merely English wealth and English freedom, but England herself." Ethelred married, Elizabeth did not—possibly with equally momentous results. "For if Elizabeth had married . . . and if her progeny had sat on the throne and continued the sway of the Tudors, half a century of turmoil and bloodshed, under the essentially foreign rule of the Stuarts, might have been spared to England. The Revolution would doubtless never have taken place. The material and intellectual advance of England and all Britain would have been steady and sure upon the splendid foundation of the Elizabethan structure." Twice, says our author, "has the religion of Europe been apparently at the mercy of a chance contingency"—once, when Themistocles out-manœuvred Aristides politically at Athens, and Mithra as well as the Persians lost the day; and again when Charles Martel turned the tide of battle against the Moslim at Tours in the eighth century. Mr. Chamberlain has written a very interesting and suggestive little book.

A THOROUGH understanding of Russia's present state is difficult without a knowledge of her past. Readers desirous of a more or less intimate acquaintance with Russian history will find "Russia; From the Varangians to the Bolsheviki" (Oxford University Press), by Raymond Beazley, Nevill Forbes,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and G. A. Birkett, a valuable and competent aid. The work is based on excellent Russian sources and is written in a readable style. The reader will learn, much to his surprise, that Russia was not always an autocratic monarchy, that she possessed democratic institutions several centuries ago, and elected her rulers, while the principality of Novgorod even practiced the right of recall. He will also find that mass movements which would now be called Bolshevist occurred in the seventeenth century, notably under the leadership of one Stenka Razin, and in the latter part of the eighteenth century, led by Pugachev. Those movements were a spontaneous reaction against oppression and the poverty in which the common people lived. Even foreign intervention in Russia, such as we are now witnessing, is not without parallel in that country's history. In 1606-1613 Poles and Swedes ravaged the country, taking advantage of the internal strife following the extinction of the dynasty which had been in power. The parallel is further strengthened by the circumstance that even then intervention was solicited by the *Boyars*, the nobility of that day. But the contending factions united in the face of the national danger, expelled the invaders and elected the first Romanoff to the throne. The book ends with the abdication of the last Czar of that dynasty. It does not deal with the Provisional Government, as the title might lead the reader to believe.

THE little brochure "Shylock Not a Jew" (The Stratford Company), by Maurice Packard and Adelaide Marshall, is rather an impassioned protest against anti-Semitism in general than a serious contribution to Shakespearean exegesis. The authors consider at great length the obvious and oft-debated perversion of law in the trial scene, recalling to us by their discussion that "Dramatic Reverie" in which R. H. Horne rewrote the scene more nearly in accordance with elementary principles of justice. They then note those characteristics in Shylock that prove him to be a caricature rather than a true picture of the Jewish nation. The two ideas, that Shylock should demand the pound of flesh, and that he should be an obedient servant of the Jewish law which forbids the shedding of blood, are incompatible. That Shylock, one of an oppressed and outcast race, should boldly appeal to the Venetian court and should even be depicted sharpening his knife in preparation for the shedding of Christian blood, is, it is contended, historically impossible. Of course it is. All the while the reviewer was reading this book the old chorus was running in his head: "Which nobody can deny, which nobody can deny!"

THE text of Mr. Henry Collins Spillman's little book entitled "Personality" (Gregg Publishing Company) would seem to be found in Dean Johnson's dictum, quoted in the Introduction: "You are a very complicated machine and you are the only person who can drive it or in any may improve it. Your friends may know a great deal about your powers mentally and physically but they cannot make you over. If you want your machine to be in the best possible running order and to do the work for which it is best fitted, you must know it more thoroughly than you do your horse or your dog." In the following chapters Mr. Spillman describes the various parts that go to make up the human machine that is called "personality," and points out how they are best driven and how they may be developed and improved. We may quote the following as a specimen of the author's manner: "Whoever believes a given task impossible achieves a result corresponding to his suspicions. Philip the Second built the resplendent Spanish Armada and sent her forth to crush the lesser English fleet. But the admiral of the Spanish Armada was given to seasickness and openly confessed to Philip his lack of confidence in the expedition. The Spanish Armada, over-equipped with guns and sailors, sailed straight into the defeat which corresponded to the mental pattern of its admiral." The questionnaires at the ends of the chapters afford the reader ample suggestions for enlarging on the matter in the text from his own experience and imagination.

CUNNINGHAM'S "History of the Sikhs" (Oxford University Press) is now seventy years old, and much of its theory has been rendered obsolete by the advance of archæology; but the groundwork was so thoroughly done that the book well deserves reprinting. Lieutenant Joseph Davey Cunningham was a son of Allan, the stone-mason poet, author of "A Wet Sheet and a Flowing Sea." He went to India in 1834 and served first on the staff of the chief engineer of the Bengal Presidency. During the first Sikh War, he was in closest contact with events as staff officer under various generals, and as eye-witness of important battles. After the war, he became political agent to the State of Bhopal. His contact with the Sikhs seems to have awakened his sympathy for the fighting, casteless Puritans of India, for he devoted about five years of his life to composing their history. His views were so displeasing to his superiors that he was sent back to regimental duty, and the disgrace hastened his death, which occurred in 1851. The fact is that Cunningham was a frank critic of British policy towards the Sikhs; and that gives his work its special value. An appendix of nearly ninety carefully prepared pages supplies much added information of permanent value on various matters connected with Sikh history and Sikh religion.

ENGLISH editions of American classics are commonly prepared by English scholars, who naïvely and sometimes patronizingly interpret Western literary attempts to their countrymen. It is an interesting change to find that the collection of "Tales by Washington Irving" in the "Oxford Edition of Standard Authors" (Humphrey Milford) has been edited by Dr. Carl Van Doren. Dr. Van Doren's admirable introduction is largely biographical, but it is full of apt characterizations of Irving's works, and it concludes with a few pages of sound general criticism. Especially telling are frequent terse but inclusive summary sentences, like this of "Rip van Winkle" and "The Legend of Sleepy Hollow": "In them for the first time Irving's wit, a little boisterous in his youth, and his poetical mood, recently somewhat mawkish over antiquities and afflictions, were mixed in perfect proportions with the material of which he had fuller knowledge than of any other." The selections have evidently been made with a strict definition of the word "tale" in mind. The "Sketch Book" is represented only by "Rip van Winkle," "The Spectre Bridegroom," and "The Legend of Sleepy Hollow'—such slow-moving and sentimental narratives as "The Pride of the Village," "The Widow and her Son," and "The Wife" being excluded. There are four selections from "Bracebridge Hall." Much more than half the volume is taken from "Tales of a Traveller," and "The Alhambra." Readers who feel that "Tales of a Traveller" is the least admirable of Irving's miscellanies will be disappointed that it is here so prominent; yet as a writer of tales, an author must be judged by the tales that he wrote.

HOWEVER appropriate may be the phrase "the silent navy," it does not apply to Secretary Daniels, whose speeches, delivered on all manner of occasions and on an average of two or three a month during the period of war, are now published under the title "The Navy and the Nation" (Doran). The heading of an address to Naval Academy graduates, "Get You a Naval Hero," may suggest Mr. Daniels's oratorical style; and a sentence from one of his talks to men in training, "I tell you there is but one morale of the service and that is morals," might serve as a general text. These patriotic and moral preachments in homely, rather threadbare phrases, display those qualities of Mr. Daniels which not only have excited a campaign of bitter derision within and without the service, but have enabled him to stand up against it and to establish a record of creditable accomplishments in both war and peace. It may be, too, that we underestimate the value of Mr. Daniels's journalistic training, for it was a critic no more kindly than Colonel Harvey who declared the Secretary's 1918 Report, part of which is here reprinted, "a classic of the war."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OBERLIN COLLEGE
REBEA OHIO

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Pater, Walter. Sketches and Reviews. Boni & Liveright. $1.25.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Barbellion, W. N. P. The Journal of a Disappointed Man. Doran. $2.

Bassett, John S., and Fay, Sidney B., editors. A Study of the Life of Hadrian Prior to His Accession. Northampton: Smith College.

Haynes, Fred E. James Baird Weaver. Iowa City: State Historical Society. $2.

Parker, Cornelia S. An American Idyll. Boston: Atlantic Press. $1.75.

Paul, Eden and Cedar, translators. Treitschke's History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century. Vol. V. McBride. $3.50.

Wells, Warre B. The Life of John Redmond. Doran. $2.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Bynner, Witter. The Beloved Stranger. Knopf. $1.50.

Donnay, Maurice. Lysistrata. Translated by Helen D. Gibbons. Paris: Eugène Fasquelle.

Kenyon, James B. The Harvest Home. New York: White & Co. $2.

Sayers, Dorothy L. Catholic Tales and Christian Songs. McBride. $1.

Scholfield, Herbert. Sonnets. Knopf. $1.50.

Thompson, Francis. The Hound of Heaven. Four Seas.

Tree, Iris. Poems. Lane. $1.50.

Whitworth, Geoffrey. Father Noah. McBride. $1.

Wilbur, Russell. Theodore Roosevelt. Houghton Mifflin. $1.

Willis, George. Any Soldier to His Son. London: Allen & Unwin.

FICTION

Begbie, Harold. The Convictions of Christopher Sterling. McBride. $1.50.

Chambers, Robert W. In Secret. Doran. $1.50.

Clemens, Samuel L. The Curious Republic of Gondour. Boni & Liveright. $1.25.

Harry, Myriam. The Little Daughter of Jerusalem. Dutton. $1.90.

Jacquemaire, Madeleine C. Les Hommes de Bonne Volonté. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

Johnston, Harry. The Gay-Dombeys. Macmillan. $1.75.

Merrick, Leonard. Cynthia. Dutton. $2.

Nadaud, Marcel. Roman de la Guerre Aérienne. Paris: Albin Michel.

O'Brien, Edward J., compiler and editor. The Great Modern English Stories. Boni & Liveright. $1.75.

Pertwee, Roland. Our Wonderful Selves. Knopf. $1.75.

Welch, Alden W. Wolves. Knopf. $1.40.

Wood, Michael. The White Island. Dutton. $1.90.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Gamewell, Mary N. New Life Currents in China. New York: Missionary Education Movement. 75 cents.

Hill, David J. Present Problems in Foreign Policy. Appleton. $1.50.

Kadomtzeff, Boris. The Russian Collapse. New York: Russian Mercantile and Industrial Corporation.

Kawakami, K. K. Japan and World Peace. Macmillan. $1.50.

Morman, James B. The Place of Agriculture in Reconstruction. Dutton. $2.

Robinson, Cyril E. New Fallacies of Midas. McBride. $2.

Sidgwick, Henry. National and International Right and Wrong. London: Allen & Unwin.

Shelby, Gertrude M. How to Face Peace. Holt. $1.50.

U. S. Geological Survey. Service Monographs of the United States Government, No. 1. Appleton.

Wildman, Edwin, editor. Reconstructing America: Our Next Big Job. Boston: Page Company. $3.

SCIENCE

Chaboseau, A. Les Serbes, Croates et Slovènes. Paris: Bossard.

Mills, John. The Realities of Modern Science. Macmillan. $2.50.

Stahl, Adolofo. Lectures in Astronomy. San Francisco: Stanford University Press.

LEO TOLSTOY'S
The Pathway of Life
In Two Volumes
Translated by Archibald J. Wolfe
"The PATHWAY OF LIFE" is Tolstoy's posthumous message to a war-torn suffering world. It is the Gospel of right living and right thinking and offers the great philosopher's panacea against world wars and misery, helping mankind to eradicate all those false feelings, desires and doctrines, personal, social, economic and religious, which are responsible for the present plight of humanity.
International Book Publishing Co.
5 Beekman Street, New York
Price $2.00 each volume

Any change of address
should be mailed to our Subscription Department at least two weeks before it is to become effective. This will insure uninterrupted delivery of *The Nation* to you, and will materially lessen the pressure of work in our office.
When notifying us be sure to give both old and new addresses and stipulate the exact date upon which you desire the change made.
SUBSCRIPTION DEPARTMENT
20 Vesey Street The Nation New York, N. Y.

Whatever book you want
Wanamaker's
has it, or will get it.
We buy old, rare books, and sets of books
NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

Books for warm days:
OUR WONDERFUL SELVES
By Roland Pertwee
¶ A gay tale of art life in Paris and the London theatre, written with a grace and verve that is almost Gallic. $1.75 net.
THE SHADOW OF MALREWARD
By J. B. Harris-Burland
¶ A rattling good detective tale with thrills, mystery and baffling situations a-plenty. $1.60 net.
At all book shops
ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 W. Forty-second St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAIN CURRENTS OF SPANISH LITERATURE

By J. D. M. FORD, of HARVARD

Present interest in Ibanez, Benavente, and other Spanish writers makes Professor Ford's book especially timely. It affords a survey of the important currents running through the history of Spanish literature as written in the motherland, and calls attention to the great worth of the work of writers in Spanish America. Given as eight lectures, the chapters retain the directness, simplicity and interest of the spoken word.

284 pp., $2.00 net

Just Published

FIFTY YEARS OF EUROPE

1870 to 1919

BY CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN

Author of EUROPE SINCE 1815

Maps. 428 pp. $2.50

HENRY HOLT & CO.

19 West 44th Street, New York

WANTED:—THREE APARTMENTS

unfurnished in same building in New York City.

No. 1. Containing living room or studio, dining room, kitchen, two bedrooms, bathroom and maid's room.

No. 2. Containing living room or studio, bedroom and bath.

No. 3. Containing living room or studio, bedroom and bath.

Location preferably out of the usual beaten paths, something not usually rented if possible, and preferably in a private house altered for such purpose. Nothing South of Greenwich Village nor North of 72nd Street will be considered. Occupancy October 1st, 1919.

Address Charles H. Davis, Bass River, Cape Cod, Massachusetts.

OLD CHELSEA

51 West 16th Street New York City

A living place for young, artistic, business and professional people

"OUT-OF-DOORS" RESTAURANT

Under Personal Management of Miss Colestock

HOTEL PURITAN

390 Commonwealth Ave.
BOSTON

Solicits the patronage of readers of the Nation.

Globe-trotters say the Puritan is one of the most homelike and attractive hotels in the world.

Wholly reasonable rates.

Send for our booklet with its guide to Boston and its historic vicinity.

N. A. COSTELLO, Manager.

When you write to an advertiser, please say that you saw his advertisement in The Nation. It will help you, him and The Nation.

Russian Cooking in Russian surroundings —delicious home food, ices, drinks—with intellectual people about you, can be found at

THE RUSSIAN INN

57 West 37th Street New York City

Phone: Greeley 6567

Foreign and American Dealers in

Rare Books, Autographs, Manuscripts, Prints, Engravings, etc.

For Sale:

A Complete Set of the Publications

of the

KELMSCOTT PRESS

70 Volumes

Including the SAVONAROLA, the ANCOATS BROTHERHOOD LEAFLET, the 2 TRIAL PAGES from FROISSART, *and the following rare privately printed items, of which only 32 copies were done as mementoes for personal friends of William Morris in* 1896:—16 PAGES OF THE FROISSART, and 2 PAGES OF THE PROJECTED FOLIO EDITION OF SIGURD.

All in original bindings excepting Shakespeare's Poems (*red vellum*) and Chaucer (*half white tooled pigskin, oaken sides*).

The CHILD CHRISTOPHER *is printed on vellum.*

Price $4,500

HENRY SOTHERAN & CO.

43, Piccadilly, London, W., England

ANTIQUARIAN BOOK COMPANY
Stratford-on-Avon, England
FIRST EDITIONS—RARE EDITIONS
FINE EDITIONS
Catalogues Mailed Free on Request

CLEAN SECOND-HAND (SURPLUS LIBRARY) BOOKS

We hold one of the largest stocks in London, including in addition to recent works MANY OLDER BOOKS WHICH ARE NOW OUT OF PRINT.

Send for our sale list (which gives the date of publication and condition of Books offered) copies post free.

DAY'S LIBRARY, LTD.

(The oldest established circulating library in London)

96 MOUNT ST., LONDON, W. 1 ENGLAND

BOOKS—All out-of-print books supplied, no matter on what subject. Write us. We can get you any book ever published. Please state wants. When in England call and see our 50,000 rare books. BAKER'S GREAT BOOKSHOP, 14-16 John Bright Street, Birmingham, England.

Autographs BOOKS Manuscripts
Catalogues post free from HERBERT E. GORFIN
1, Walerand Road, Lewisham, London, S.E.13

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES TO BE HAD at ABRAHAM'S BOOK STORE, 145 4th Avenue

FOR THE BOOK LOVER
Rare books—First editions.
Latest Catalogue Sent on Request
C. GERHARDT, 25 W. 42d Street, New York

QUARTERLY REVIEW

$4.50 *per year* *English Edition* $1.50 *per copy*
LEONARD SCOTT PUB. CO., 249 W. 13th St., New York

Le Livre Contemporain

A magazine devoted to French Literature Sent free on application.

SCHOENHOF BOOK CO.

French Bookshop

15 Beacon Street Boston, Mass.

THE SUNWISE TURN, Inc.

2 East 31st Street, New York

We have ready several important volumes of critical literature.

The Dance of Siva By ANANDA COOMARASWAMY. Contains fourteen essays on phases of the creative will. $3.00

Rodin By RAINER MARIA RILKE. Is a finely wrought romantic critique. $1.50

The Intellectuals and the Wage Workers By HERBERT ELLSWORTH CORY. A pioneer attempt to define the relation to the present unrest of new knowledge in psychology, history, etc. $2.00

MUNDANE

A Story of the United States in 1921

As an Industrial Republic with Competition and Co-operation in keen Rivalry for Efficiency and with the Single Tax as the only compulsory feature of moment in the land. The story prepaid,

Ten Cents. For Sale at

PAUL ELDER & COMPANY
239 Grant Ave., San Francisco, Cal.

THE GREAT ALTERNATIVE:

Saner Politics or Revolution

By LEONARD J. REID, M.A. Crown 8vo. $2.25 net.

Discusses problems which business men and private citizens will have to face in the coming peace.

"Real, sane, considered, democratic progress —or Revolution, that is the great alternative. In the program of real liberalism the author discusses wealth; living conditions, and trade politics.—*Monthly Bulletin.*

There is here an exceptional amount of common sense, the one thing of which the world has the greatest need today.—*The Review.*

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers
FOURTH AVENUE AND 30TH St., N. Y.

CIVILIZATION

By Georges Duhamel

Won the Goncourt Prize for 1918. Masterly fiction presenting the French sodlier as he is. Price $1.50.

CENTURY CO. NEW YORK

FIELD AND STUDY

By JOHN BURROUGHS

A new collection of essays dealing, for the most part, with nature and outdoor life. $1.50 net.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, Boston

THE EQUITIST

Stands for Equality of Opportunity
15 weeks for 25 cents, if you mention *The Nation*
Address Longbranch, Wash.

Literary Agency

ALICE KAUSER
DRAMATISTS' AGENT—PLAYS
1402 Broadway, New York Established 1895
MOTION PICTURE DEPARTMENT
R. L. GIFFEN Associate and Manager

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1919 No. 2817

Inquisition in India

By SURENDRA KARR

THE British consider that they have established a "good form of government" in India. Yet within the past three months they have passed more stringent legislation against sedition than any other country in the world; such legislation can be possible only where there is bad government. The Rowlatt Commission, under the guidance of Judge Rowlatt, of London, with a few Englishmen and one Indian, spent many months investigating revolutionary conspiracies in India. Their investigations were largely confined to police records; never did they, according to their own confession, consult the public, for whose safety the Commission ostensibly undertook their work.

The outcome of the Rowlatt investigation was the presentation to the Governor-General-in-Council of two measures known as the Rowlatt Bills. The recent passage of these measures has rocked the very foundation of British rule in India. People of every shade of opinion and belief have united in protest against this legalized pillage of human rights. The workers for India's independence, at whom the bills were especially aimed, have strengthened their organization from one end of the country to the other, and have consolidated their power to advance the programme of the emancipation of India.

The Rowlatt Bills were passed over the protests of even the most conservative Indian members of the pseudo-legislature, and despite the opposition of the public—loyalists, moderates, and extremists—while nine members of the Imperial Legislative Council have already resigned. There are two of these Bills, with many sections and sub-sections. The first is an amendment of the Indian Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1898, and the second makes provision for emergency powers for the Government, supplementing the ordinary Criminal Law in special circumstances.

Sec. 2 of Bill No. 1 reads thus:

In Chapter 17 of the Indian Penal Code, after Section 124-A, the following section shall be inserted, namely:

124-B. Whoever has in his possession any seditious document intending that the same shall be published or circulated, shall, unless he proves that he had such document in his possession for a lawful purpose, be punished with imprisonment which may extend to two years or with fine or with both.

Explanation: For the purposes of this section, the expression "seditious document" means any document containing any word, signs, or visible representations which instigate or are likely to instigate, whether directly or indirectly—

(a) the use of criminal force against His Majesty or the Government established by law in British India, or against public servants or any individual public servant.

Men may be arrested and imprisoned for being in the possession of both published and unpublished documents, and also published and unpublished pictures of a "seditious" nature. Even during the Spanish Inquisition, persons were provided with an index of proscribed books.

There is no way of knowing what will be considered seditious until after the conviction. In accordance with British India judicial precedent, it is held that absence of affection is disaffection [vide B. G. Tilak, 22 B 112 (134)], and to excite or attempt to excite disaffection for the Government is one form of sedition. Under the circumstances, any person criticizing the action of an ordinary police official, not to mention higher authorities, may be considered seditious.

The method of arrest and trial will give a clearer idea of the drastic nature of the new bills. Bill No. 2, Section 25, provides:

(1) That the local Government shall forward to the investigating authority a concise statement in writing setting forth plainly the grounds on which the Government considered it necessary that the order should be made.

(2) The investigating authority shall then hold an inquiry *in camera* for the purpose of ascertaining what in its opinion, having regard to the facts and circumstances adduced by the Government, appears against the person in respect of whom the order has been made.

Provided that the investigating authority shall not disclose to the person whose case is before it any fact the communication of which might endanger the public safety or the safety of any individual.

Provided further, that nothing in this sub-section shall be deemed to entitle the person in question to appear or to be represented before the investigating authority by pleader, nor shall the local Government be so entitled.

(3) Subject to the provisions of sub-section (2), the inquiry shall be conducted in such manner as the investigating authority considers best and suited to elicit the facts of the case; and in making the inquiry such authority shall not be bound to observe the rules of the law of evidence.

It is evident, then, that the inquiry may be held in secrecy; the accused will have no way of securing legal advice; he may not bring any witness to testify for him. The investigating authority is armed with arbitrary power to do as it pleases, for it "shall not be bound to observe the rules of the law of evidence." "The inquiry shall be conducted in such manner as the investigating authority finds best suited to elicit the facts of the case." It is known to all students of history that in order to obtain confessions, the Inquisition resorted to the process of weakening physical strength, and to torture. In India, even before the adoption of the provision quoted above, suspects and detenues have been thrown into dark, solitary cells and deprived of food, sleep, and rest. The testimony of political prisoners for many years past proves that methods of actual physical torture have been practiced by the authorities. Innumerable instances can be cited in connection with the operations of the Defense of India Act, and Regulation III of 1818, whereby investigating authorities have been legally empowered to adopt most inhuman and obnoxious methods in obtaining confessions.

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps nowhere in the civilized world is there sanction for trial without jury. The Star Chamber of the Tudor and Stuart periods in England, however, has been revived, in the twentieth century, in India. The Rowlatt Bills provide (Bill No. 2, Sec. 5), for a special court of three High Court Judges, who may sit at any place where they may deem best, and no jury is permitted to sit with them. Juries are excluded in accordance with the recommendation of the Rowlatt Commission, which says: "We think it necessary to exclude juries and assessors, mainly because of the terrorism to which they are liable." Behind closed doors the trial will be conducted, and there is no way by which the public may learn the method of procedure or the evidence produced. Section 11 of Bill No. 2 says:

The Court may prohibit or restrict in such way as it may direct the publication or disclosure of its proceedings.

According to Section 15 of Bill No. 2, the accused may be convicted of an offence with which he is not charged. This section provides:

If in any trial under this part it is proved that the accused has committed any offence, whether a scheduled offence or not, the Court may convict the accused of that offence although he was not charged with it.

In other words, if a person is concluding his defense and is proving himself innocent, a sudden charge may be brought against him of an entirely different nature than that before the Court. Under the provision of the bills, he is not permitted to prepare for this new charge in order adequately to present his defence.

A convicted person has no right to make any appeal from the judgment of the Court. Section 17, Bill No. 2, provides that:

The judgment of the Court shall be final and conclusive, and, notwithstanding the provisions of the code or of any other law for the time being in force or of anything having the force of law by whatsoever authority made or done, there shall be no appeal from any order or sentence of the Court, and no High Court shall have authority to revise any such order, to sentence or to transfer any case from such Court, or to make any order under Section 491 of the Code, or have any jurisdiction of any kind in respect of any proceedings under this part.

The Court may now ignore the Indian Evidence Act of 1872. If the witness for the prosecution cannot present his evidence in person for one reason or another, his statements before a police officer will be recorded as true. He can thus escape cross-examination. Truth or falsity will never be determined. Or, in reality, the witness may be dead, or may never have existed at all.

Sec. 18, Bill No. 2. 1. (a) The statement of any person has been recorded by a Magistrate, and such statement has been read over and explained to the person making it and has been signed by him, or

(b) The statement of any person has been recorded by the Court, but such person has not been cross-examined, such statement may be admitted in evidence by the Court if the person making the same is dead or cannot be found or is incapable of giving evidence, and the Court is of opinion that such death, disappearance, or incapacity has been caused in the interests of the accused.

The accused, once convicted, must continue to carry his burden of guilt. After the expiration of his prison sentence, he will have to execute bonds with security for good behavior, and must remain in a specified area. Bill No. 1, Sec. 6, 566-A provides:

When any person is convicted of an offence punishable under chapter 11 of the Indian Penal Code, the Court may, if it thinks fit at the time of passing sentence on such person, order him on his release, after the expiration of such sentence, to execute a bond with sureties for his good behavior so far as offences under Chapter 11 of the said Code are concerned, for such period not exceeding two years as it thinks fit.

The convicted person is not free after giving bonds. He must "notify the local Government of his residence and any change of residence after release for the period for which security is required." (Sec. 6, Sub-Sec. 3, Bill No. 1.) If any of his friends or relatives associate with the accused, though not sharing his views or approving of his actions, they will be liable to prosecution. Furthermore, a person once convicted of a political offence may never thereafter write or take part in public discussions on political subjects.

The local Government is armed with arbitrary power. Since in India there is no separation of judicial and executive functions, the power of the local Government becomes especially dangerous. Bill No. 2, Part III, Sec. 33, provides:

(1) Where, in the opinion of the local Government, there are reasonable grounds for believing that any person has been or is concerned in such area in any scheduled offence, the local Government may make in respect of such person any order authorized by Section 21, and may further, by order in writing, direct—

(a) The arrest of any person without warrant; (b) the confinement of any such person in such place and under such conditions and restrictions as it may specify; and (c) the search of any place specified in the order which, in the opinion of the local Government, has been, is being, or is about to be, used by any such person for any purpose prejudicial to the public safety.

Could any martial law be more strict than this even during a time of actual war? India will have to live under such conditions in time of peace. If the suspected person cannot be located, the sanctity of any home may be violated. Bill No. 2, Sec. 3, provides that:

The arrest of any person in pursuance of an order under clause (a) of sub-section (1) may be effected at any place where he may be found by any police officer or by any other officer of Government to whom the order may be directed.

(3) An order for confinement under Clause (b) or for search under Clause (c) of sub-section (1) may be carried out by any officer of Government to whom the order may be directed, and such officer may use any and every means to enforce the same.

As to the order for search, authority is given "for the seizure of anything found in such place which the person executing the order has reason to believe is being used or is likely to be used for any purpose prejudicial to the public safety, and the provisions of the Code so far as they can be made applicable shall apply to searches made under the authority of any such order and to the disposal of any property seized in any search. (Bill No. 2, Sec. 35, Part III.)

The *Modern Review*, of Calcutta, a monthly magazine of note, cleverly summarizes the points of similarity between the Spanish Inquisition and the Star Chamber proceedings and the Rowlatt Bills:

(1) Sudden arrest without warrant on mere suspicion, and detention without trial;
(2) Conduct of the proceedings secretly *in camera;*
(3) The person under trial ignorant of the name, etc., of his accusors or of the witnesses against him;
(4) The accused not confronted with his accusors or the witnesses against him;
(5) The accused having only the right to a written account of the offences attributed to him;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(6) The accused not enjoying the right of defending himself with the help of lawyers;
(7) No witnesses allowed in his defence;
(8) Judicial procedure quite different from that to which we are accustomed;
(9) Trial or investigation of indefinite duration.

Historical retrospection proves that repressive and oppressive measures are not effective in checking revolutionary movements. The Parliamentary Report of 1812, on the affairs of the East India Company, describes a revolutionary movement in India during that period. In 1857, India fought, though unsuccessfully, a war of independence. In 1878, Lord Lytton's policy of reaction and repression threw the country into insurgency against British rule. Vasudev Balwant Fadke's political activities in 1878 bear a striking resemblance to the present-day revolution in India. In 1883-1884, India was in furious excitement over the Ilbert Bill, and revolutionary activities were common. In 1885, the Indian National Congress was organized. Though the Moderates pursued the path of least resistance, an undercurrent of political discontent was flowing in the country. Upon the partition of Bengal in 1905 the real revolutionary organization was perfected.

The British Government has passed innumerable repressive measures, but none has been effective in stopping the revolution that springs from the heart of the people. No provision was made for sedition when Macauley first drafted the Penal Code in the thirties of the last century, and still nothing was contained in the revision of the Code after the Indian Government came directly under the Crown in 1858. The sedition section, 124-A, was first inserted in 1871 by Sir James Stephen. In 1898 it was enacted that the mere publication of penalized words would be regarded as sedition. Since then we have had the Official Secrets Acts, the Newspaper (incitement to offences) Acts, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, the Seditious Meetings Act, the Indian Press Acts, the Conspiracy Act, and the Defence of India Act. In addition, the deportation regulations of 1818, 1819, and 1827 have been regularly resorted to.

Commenting upon the Rowlatt Bills, Mr. Bonkesh Chakravarti, barrister-at-law (a Moderate in his political convictions), at a meeting held recently in Calcutta, said:

> If in a state one can be arrested and imprisoned without a trial, if the only safeguard for one's personal freedom in a state be secret investigation *in camera* without legal aid, and without the wholesome restraint of the rules of evidence, if one can be convicted of possession of a document, known to be seditious, I say it is a state where the law is not within the harness of civilization.

Opposed to the Indian viewpoint is the British imperial mind, as expressed in the *Englishman* of Calcutta, of March 4. This journal maintains that the "only thing the Government can decently do is to withdraw its promise to set a time limit to the Act and place the measure permanently on the statute book." The recent pronouncements of the Governor General are in strict accordance with the sentiments of the *Englishman*. A telegram from Simla, dated April 22, states that the Governor-General has "promulgated a new ordinance providing that any court-martial or commission may sentence a person convicted under martial law to transportation for life or for ten years, or rigorous imprisonment for seven years and not exceeding fourteen years." The Defence of India Act has also been amended to provide that no newspaper may be printed or published without previous sanction of the local Government.

China and the Peace Settlement

BY GILBERT REID

THE war has wrought havoc to China and gain to Japan. Germany's interests in China have been injured commercially; China's interests have been injured politically. Japan's position in China has been strengthened both politically and commercially. The confirmation of these changes is to be found in the treaty of peace and the covenant of the League of Nations. It is in respect to China that the treaty and the covenant show how far short they fall of meeting the high ideals and great professions of Americans and the Allied or Associated peoples—of those who are victors in the greatest war of the ages.

The Articles of the treaty present a fairly accurate indication of the conferees' conception of justice, law, and equity when applied to a historic but unmilitary nation like China and to an equally historic but strongly military nation like Japan. The result is a profit and loss account, in which the profit is to Japan and the loss to China. The cause of righteousness is even more a loser. For Germany, an enemy, to be a loser may in the main be right; but why should China, first a neutral and then an ally, be made to lose? Why should the Big Three decide against China and for Japan, after inducing China to forego its neutrality and join the Allies in the world contest?

The main decision reached by the treaty as to Chino-Japanese relations is that the German-leased territory of Kiaochow, including the port and town of Tsingtao, is ceded by Germany to Japan. Germany is required to sign the treaty which makes such strange disposition of territorial property, situated not in Germany, not even in Japan, but in China, and of which China alone is proprietor. Germany merely held a temporary lease, and in securing the lease it was stipulated with China, the other contracting party, that it should never be transferred to any other country. It was assumed that if Germany ever relinquished the lease, the territorial property would revert to China, the original and real owner. The makers of the treaty of peace therefore compel Germany to break an agreement which she made with China and to China's advantage; this too, when China is an ally of the victorious nations.

How, then, does it come that the transfer is made, not to China, but to Japan? It comes in the first place as the spoils of war and the right of conquest. In a word, the treaty not only enforces the cession of Kiaochow to Japan, but confirms a bad principle, supposed to have no place in a model settlement, that of the right of conquest. To be sure, the conquest was hardly impressive since some 7,000 Germans were defeated by the Japanese army and navy, but it gave Japan the chance to proclaim itself the first victor over mighty Germany.

The treaty, moreover, practically condones Japan's illegal method of effecting the conquest. In violation of the Hague Convention, Japan landed its guns and troops at the Chinese port of Lungkow, which was not leased to any foreign country or set apart as a treaty port, and transported guns and troops across the neutral territory of China to attack Tsingtao in the rear. It seems strange that moralists and legalists who complain of Germany's violations of inter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national law should so readily countenance a clear violation on the part of Japan.

The treaty makes no stipulation that Japan is to restore Kiaochow to China. So far as the treaty of peace is concerned, such restoration is not required; it is only required that Japan secure the cession from Germany. Should Japan never restore Kiaochow to China, there could be no cause of complaint so far as the treaty is concerned. In fact this restoration by Japan to China is deemed to be outside the jurisdiction of the peace conferees or even of the League of Nations, but is an affair solely of Japan, or, if it so pleases, of joint conference between Japan and China, in which China will of necessity do what Japan wishes.

Such mutual agreement was reached by treaty between the two Governments in 1915, after presentation of the Twenty-One Demands, and then of an ultimatum. The Chinese have asked that all the Agreements of 1915 be declared abrogated by the signers of the League or the signers of the treaty, because China's signature to the Agreements was enforced, and because the Agreements were made under duress. The Big Four, being engaged in making a treaty also to be signed under duress, could not be expected to give serious consideration to China's complaint.

According to the Chino-Japanese Agreement of 1915, Kiaochow is indeed to be restored, at some future time, to China, but only on four conditions, one of which gives Japan the first choice of a concession in Tsingtao, and another allows other nations to have second choice of a site for the establishment of an International Settlement under joint jurisdiction. China has the third choice; that is, she is given what is left, the poorest, least advantageous part of Tsingtao.

Another matter dealt with in the treaty of peace is the German railway and mining concessionary rights in Shantung province—rights originally granted to Germany by the Chinese Government. The treaty allots them all to Japan, not to China. There is even no private understanding that ultimately these rights shall pass to China, although the Japanese first secured them by military force and military occupation. The occupation took place, after the German defenders of Tsingtao became prisoners of war, by a process in clear violation of the Hague Convention. Japanese troops were marched across the neutral territory of China all the way from the port of Tsingtao to the provincial capital, Tsinan-fa. This illegal performance is condoned by the treaty of peace, which secures Japanese control of the former German concessions.

This allocation of the spoils of war—a valuable property amounting to many millions—was actually determined in 1917 by secret agreements with Japan by the four Allied nations, Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy, in consideration that Japan would allow China to go into the war. The Japanese knew very well that, in accordance with usage, China, on declaring war against Germany, would *ipso facto* come into possession of these rights and properties by the termination of existing treaties. To forestall such advantage to China, the four Allies had to guarantee these rights and properties to Japan. Though contrary to all precedent, the peace conferees have upheld this secret engagement entered into at the expense of China, and have embodied its principles in the treaty of peace.

The treaty also states that all "rights of exploitation" in Shantung pass equally to Japan. We had sometimes dreamed that Woodrow Wilson would be able to persuade his diplomatic comrades to abandon the baneful policy of exploiting weak nations, but, instead, we find exploitation incorporated as a principle in the treaty of peace.

In this connection there are two misconceptions rather current among the American people. One is that the Shantung peninsula has been acquired by Japan. This is wrong. All that Japan secures, outside of Kiaochow, are those economic privileges in Shantung once granted to Germany by China. The second misconception arises from a statement made occasionally by Japanese diplomats, that in return for economic privileges in Shantung, Japan restores Shantung to China in complete sovereignty. But China has never relinquished its sovereignty in Shantung, and the Japanese never before claimed that Japan had in any way infringed on China's sovereignty. Japan thus pretends to generosity in giving up that which it has never acquired, and China gets back that which it has never given up.

A few minor stipulations are outlined in another section of the treaty.

(1) The Chinese are relieved of paying any more of the Boxer indemnity to Germany. This relief actually came when China declared war on Germany, but the treaty makes it appear that the relief was granted through the thoughtfulness of the Allied nations. The Chinese had indeed asked that they be relieved of the Boxer indemnity to *all* countries, but all that the Allied countries can now promise is that Germany shall be forced to renounce its share. Others may follow later.

(2) Germany renounces in favor of China all "public property" in the German concessions of Tientsin, Hankow, and elsewhere, "except Kiaochow" (where most of such property exists).

(3) The astronomical instruments seized by Germans in 1900 and 1901 are to be sent back to Peking. Several years ago the German Government consented to return the instruments, but the Chinese politely declined. Now the great restitution will be made.

(4) Germany relinquishes the German concessions of Tientsin and Hankow. China in acquiring them must "open them to international use," thus granting more than the Japanese need grant in the future Japanese concession in Tsingtao.

(5) Germany is forbidden to present any claims against China or the Allied and Associated nations in connection with the repatriation of Germans and the liquidation of German private property.

(6) The Medical and Engineering School carried on by Germans in Shanghai, situated in the French concession, must be given over to the joint control of the French and Chinese. The educational work of the Germans in Tsingtao is transferred to the Japanese, and that in Shanghai comes under French direction.

The covenant of the League also affects China, equally to its disadvantage. An Article has been inserted withdrawing from the control of the covenant all "regional understandings." The Monroe Doctrine of the United States is thus protected. But Japan, too, has a doctrine regarding its prior position and special interests in China, already officially recognized in the Lansing-Ishii exchange of notes. The covenant cannot touch such an understanding based on "propinquity of territory." For China to sign the covenant and the treaty "with reservations," in the hope that the League of Nations will alter the wrongs now done to her, is to remain year after year in a school of illusion. As Dr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Felix Adler has written: "It is said that half a loaf is better than no bread, and that compromises are unavoidable. But no bread is better than a fraction of a loaf if that fraction contains poison."

The framers of the covenant rejected the Japanese proposal that all the nations which entered the League be considered equal, with no racial discrimination. This was a wise proposal, in no way affecting the question of immigration. When the proposal was voted down by the Big Four, Japan's arm was strengthened to demand and secure all she desired in Shantung. It is also to be remembered that Japan was at the outset a member of the Big Five. When it became the Big Four, Japan was left out. All the more was she able to insist that her claims be met as to Shantung.

China made many requests to the Peace Conference, had a hearing, published secret agreements, and opposed Japan. China trusted to America, Great Britain, and France for succor from the growing domination of Japan. How much China has gained we have seen above. It is not China, but Japan in China, that is stronger than before the war, and before the framing of that treaty which is to assure the world a reign of justice under lasting peace.

The White Man's Burden in Egypt

THE recent serious and widespread uprisings in Egypt, regarding which scanty reports were published in the United States, resulted in vigorous action on the part of the British authorities and the dispatch to Egypt of General Allenby as Special High Commissioner with "full discretionary powers." On April 22, at the height of the disturbance, President Wilson recognized the British protectorate over Egypt which had been proclaimed on December 18, 1914. The following address on the situation in Egypt and the policy of the British Government, delivered by Lord Curzon in the House of Lords on May 15, is taken from the *Times* (London) of May 16.

Six weeks have now elapsed since I made my last statement and during that period there has certainly been an improvement in the situation in Egypt, although it cannot yet be described as satisfactory. In the provinces order has been generally restored and the cultivators have returned to work. In some of the towns, however, and especially in Cairo, there have been sporadic disturbances which have had to be quelled by force. The Azhar University continues to be a centre of agitation and the students have throughout taken a leading part in fomenting disorders. As regards what has occurred in the provinces, your lordships will have read with horror and indignation of the dastardly murder of eight unarmed British officers and men returning from a holiday at Luxor in the Upper Egypt express. That is now many weeks ago and in the earlier stages of the outbreak. Later reports show that this crime was perpetrated by the local fellaheen, and not, as was at first supposed, by the Bedouin. The peasant of Upper Egypt is naturally violent in character and on the present occasion reports, for which there was not the remotest vestige of foundation, of outrages alleged to have been committed by British troops, such as the burning of mosques and assaults on women, may have led to such an outbreak of ferocity. The whole matter is being made the subject of judicial inquiry and justice will be done.

There was also in Cairo an organized attack on the peaceful Armenian inhabitants, forty of whom were killed or injured, and several thousands of others had to be collected in a refugee camp under British military protection. . . .

Attempts have been made to represent that atrocities have been committed by British troops in Egypt. Such allegations are a natural form for Nationalist propaganda to take. They are entirely devoid of truth. The troops have shown most praiseworthy restraint in very trying circumstances, especially when it is remembered that, apart from the outrage on the Luxor express, there have been a number of brutal murders of isolated and unarmed British soldiers by the native mob, and patrols and sentries have been sniped and ambushed without the least provocation. I am glad to say that various reports received and in some cases published as to outrages and murders of British civilians and women in outlying districts do not appear to have any foundation in fact beyond that of the murder of a British railway inspector and the ill-treatment of his wife. But several civilians had narrow escapes, and in certain cases Egyptians have shown courage and devotion in saving them.

In my last statement to your lordships I alluded to the good behavior of many of the Egyptian officials and of the army and police. In so far as certain of the first of these categories is concerned my statement was destined to be falsified. At the beginning of April nearly all the officials in Government offices struck work, to their own detriment and to the loss and inconvenience of their fellow-countrymen, and all the efforts of Rushdi Pasha and Egyptian Ministers to induce them to return to their duties failed. Among their demands were complete independence for Egypt and immediate official recognition of Saad Zaghlul and the Nationalist leaders as the representatives of the Egyptian nation. On April 22, General Allenby issued a proclamation calling upon them to return to work at once under penalty of dismissal. This proclamation had the desired effect, and within a short period the majority of the officials concerned had returned to their duties. Similarly, the students who had left their schools and colleges were ordered to return to work by May 3. Only a small percentage has done so and the schools have been closed.

Immediately after his arrival, General Allenby, in the exercise of the full discretionary powers granted to him as Special High Commissioner, decided that the principal Nationalists should be permitted to leave Egypt for Europe and that the four leaders, including Zaghlul Pasha, who had been interned at Malta, should be given the same freedom. This concession led to the immediate formation of an Egyptian Ministry under Rushdi Pasha. The principal task of this Ministry was to induce the Government officials to return to work, but in this task it failed completely, and after barely a fortnight in office it resigned on April 22, since which date the affairs of Egypt have been conducted without the assistance of native Ministers. In the meantime, Zaghlul Pasha and his partisans arrived in Paris on April 19. They had styled themselves the Egyptian National Deputation, but the enjoyment of ample funds and the capacity to spend them does not appear so far to have been attended by definite results.

On April 22, President Wilson recognized the British protectorate over Egypt proclaimed on December 18, 1914. Our protectorate had been recognized by the French and by the late Imperial Russian Government at the time when the declaration was made in 1914. As your lordships are aware, a clause has now been inserted in the peace treaties with the enemy Powers under which they will all be called upon to recognize the British protectorate over Egypt, nor can a long period elapse before it will have received universal recognition. The moment will shortly come, if it has not already arrived, when moderate and sober-minded Egyptians—for such there are—will ask themselves whether the game has been worth playing, and will begin to apportion responsibility. I regret to record that the damage inflicted on railway equipment and communications during the outbreak has been very serious. Indispensable structures and instruments have been destroyed which cannot easily be repaired or replaced. The difficulties of transport and travel are already

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

causing inconvenience, but will be more severely felt at the end of the summer when the crops have to be moved. The loss and hardship will fall not on the agitators and students who organized and led the campaign of destruction, but upon the landowners and cultivators who may have taken part in it, but will soon realize that they themselves are the principal sufferers and that they have been grievously misled.

What in the end will this Egyptian outbreak, with its concomitant loss of life, widespread suffering, and destruction of property have achieved? If it was undertaken for the purpose of terminating the British connection in Egypt and obtaining Egyptian independence it was foredoomed to failure. I cannot declare too emphatically that his Majesty's Government have no intention whatever of ignoring or abandoning the obligations and responsibilities which they incurred when the task of governing Egypt was placed upon their shoulders. If the agitation had been intended to call attention to the legitimate aspirations and to grievances or dissatisfaction with the existing system of administration, then the method adopted was hardly one by which that end could best be attained. The British Government has always been ready to lend a sympathetic ear to what Egyptian Ministers and responsible representatives of Egyptian opinion had to say on these subjects. We should, indeed, have been quite ready to have heard what Zaghlul Pasha and his friends had to say if they had not opened the proceedings by demanding our complete retirement from the country, which was an impossible condition and did not provide a basis for reasonable discussion. That there are no Egyptian aspirations, his Majesty's Government would be the last to declare, and they must be recognized and should not be exaggerated. There are few nations which have not suffered hardships during the period of the war; there are few which have been in such a fortunate position as Egypt in escaping to so large an extent, owing to British protection, the loss, privations, and sufferings of the past four years.

In Egypt, the Government reserve fund has been increased threefold. The national wealth has grown by leaps and bounds, and there is no reason to believe the population as a whole has not shared in the general prosperity. In Egypt, as elsewhere, the professional classes and town inhabitants have not benefited to the same extent as those in the country, and the rise in prices has been out of all proportion to the increase of their resources. This has naturally caused discontent. Egypt could scarcely escape being affected by the general wave of unrest, dissatisfaction, and vague political aspirations which is passing over the entire world as the after-effects of four years of crisis. There is, further, no doubt that the *amour propre* of the intellectual classes has been wounded by the fact that no place was found for Egypt at the Peace Conference, at which there were representatives of the Indian Empire, the Arab kingdom and of the Hedjaz. There have also been fears of a contemplated replacing of Egyptian by British officials on a large scale, although no such policy would meet with any favor here.

The rough draft of the proposals for constitutional reforms, shown privately to Rushdi Pasha, seems also to have created unnecessary alarm. Nor are the causes of unrest among the agricultural classes far to seek. The successive British Commanders-in-Chief in the East have all borne testimony to the valuable services rendered to our army by the Egyptian Labor and Camel Corps. During the past two years their numbers have been maintained at a high figure, and their recruitment has undoubtedly given opportunities to the class of minor native officials for corruption and favoritism, which escaped proper control owing to depletion in the ranks of the British Inspectorate, absorbed in other war duties. The same may be said with regard to fodder and foodstuffs. Stories of cases of ill-treatment have appeared in the press and are under investigation by the military authorities. I should be slow to believe that proceedings could have occurred which would have been foreign to the traditions of the British army, or that the treatment of the Labor Corps was less good than was the pay and nourishment given to them. (Hear, hear.) Full use has been made by unscrupulous agitators of grievances, some imaginary and others undoubtedly real, but which nearly all have arisen from war conditions, which predisposed Egyptians to rebel. The result has been a systematically organized outbreak of extreme violence, and on an extended scale, in which enemy instigation and influence and prolonged preparation are clearly discernible.

So much for the past; your noble lordships will now expect me to say something about the views and intentions of the Government in the future. It has always been the intention of his Majesty's Government to take the very earliest opportunity when the war was over, and when the peace negotiations had reached a stage which rendered it possible, to form and send out to Egypt a strong commission. This commission would determine the nature of the new Protectorate, and would submit recommendations with regard to the future administration of that country. Recent events have increased, rather than diminished, the need for such an inquiry, and the Government propose to dispatch a special mission, over which Lord Milner has been invited to preside, to inquire into the causes of the late disorders in Egypt and to report on the existing situation in that country and the form of Constitution which, under the Protectorate, will be best calculated to promote its peace and prosperity and the progressive development of self-governing institutions and the protection of foreign interests. The mission will be sent with the full knowledge and approval of the Special High Commissioner in Egypt, and will rely upon his assistance.

In the meantime, General Allenby is preparing the ground by systematic local inquiry into the direct causes of the recent disorders and the grievance of the fellaheen in particular, and the abuses of power by the local authorities. The evidence thus collected will be invaluable to the special commission when it reaches Egypt. I trust and believe that the result of the mission will be to clear away misunderstandings and to confirm the British Protectorate in Egypt under conditions which will be equally satisfactory to the protecting Power and to the inhabitants of the country. We have never had the least wish to repress the Egyptians' individuality; on the contrary, we accept the principle that Egyptians should be, in an ever-increasing share, in the government of their country, and it is our earnest desire to see Egypt under our protectorate advance in prosperity and take her rightful place as the leading Islamic Power.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandinavian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with *The Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documents

The Demands of Denmark

THE opposition of the Danish Government to any solution of the Schleswig-Holstein problem which involves the annexation to Denmark of the German sections of Schleswig was voiced by the Danish Foreign Minister, Mr. Scavenius, in a recent address, the larger part of which follows.

The great war gave rise to fears for Denmark's fate, but simultaneously it gave rise to hope in many Danish hearts that events might lead to a happy solution of the national question. On account of Denmark's neutral position, lying, as it were, between two belligerents, the Danish Government was obliged to observe the greatest reticence and caution.

When, therefore, during the war, anxiety arose in this country, lest the war should forever deprive the Danish people of their hope of reunion with the Danish population in Schleswig, and questions were put to me about investigating the possibility of obtaining support from the Norwegian and Swedish Governments to enter into negotiations with the German Government regarding the frontier question, I declined to consider this plan. As I have already had opportunity to say at the secret meeting of Parliament, my insistent view has always been that if Denmark did enter into such negotiations, counterclaims might be presented by Germany, which we should have to regard as incompatible with our position as an independent and neutral state. I have further maintained, that even if it were conceivable that our position in this respect would be eased by support from Norway and Sweden, the fact still remained, that the Allies would be unable to understand or accept such negotiations during the war, and that they would therefore be incompatible with Denmark's policy of neutrality. Negotiations have consequently not taken place.

Germany's acceptance of Wilson's points did not change the Danish Government's conception of the situation, because the question now had to be considered as a matter between the German Government and that population whose national right to self-determination was concerned. The Danish Government has, therefore, first raised the question externally, when enabled to do so on the basis of the North-Schleswig Electors' Association's petition to lay the claims of this population before the Peace Conference at Paris.

Meanwhile, I now see that other claims have been presented at Paris, which have not been supported by the Danish Government. These claims emanate from German Schleswig quarters and have as objects to gain admission for them into Denmark. The Peace Conference has, by the introduction into the peace preliminaries of a third voting zone, accommodated these German elements so far as to give them permission to vote. This permission to vote has been granted the German Schleswigers against the wishes of the Danish Government, the Danish Parliament, and the Danish Schleswigers, and when the Danish people maintains its standpoint, it ought not to have consequences for Denmark.

It has, therefore, given me satisfaction to see a telegram to the Copenhagen newspaper, *Berlingske Tidende*, from its special correspondent at Paris, stating, that it is pointed out at Paris, that the decision arrived at in no way puts either the Danish Government or the Danish Parliament under obligations, for the very reason that they have had no share in the decision taken. I feet convinced that the Allied and Associated Powers, to whom the Danish people gratefully owe the hope of being again united, do not wish that the bright hopes of the Danish nation shall be obscured by the thought of those dangers and difficulties which are attached to the presence of considerable national German elements within the new borders of Denmark.

It is a question of life and death for Denmark to remain a national state, nor can it be in the interest of the Allied and Associated Powers to create a mixed Danish and German state with all its consequences. I shall not dwell upon the difficulties for Denmark in setting up a satisfactory form of local government in German Schleswig, though this question also assumes an international character if it comes to agreements concerning the position of the national German elements in Denmark. On the other hand, I must point out the possibility of German interference and influence in Denmark, and the possibility of future international complications, if we do not now obtain the national solution of the question. History teaches us enough about that. Neither the world at large nor Denmark will have any excuse, if the lessons of history are once more neglected.

The Montenegrin Situation

MR. Y. SPASSOYEVITCH, lawyer and member of the Montenegrin National Assembly, recently sent to the representatives of the Great Powers a note on the present situation of his country, of which the following text appeared in *La Volonté du Peuple* (Paris).

Agents of the ex-King of Montenegro have of late been spreading false and interested rumors about the recent situation in Montenegro.

In the interest of truth and justice, in the interest of the Montenegrins, I have determined publicly to set forth the exact truth of the present situation in Montenegro.

Montenegro is a small Serbian state, inhabited exclusively by Serbs. Montenegro and Serbia have the same language, the same traditions and customs, the same history.

In the time of the old Serbian state, Montenegro was called Zeta, and was an integral part of that state. The capital of Zeta was Skador (Scutari), which served as the residence of the Serbian heirs apparent. The country did not receive its present name until about the end of the fifteenth century.

Montenegro has constantly struggled against the Turks, side by side with the rest of their brother Serbs.

When, in 1804, Karageorges raised the standard of liberty and created Serbia, he did not succeed in including Montenegro, which was separated from Serbia by the Sanjak of Novi-Bazar; and Montenegro, being thus isolated, founded a dynasty of its own. But the Montenegrins, as before, continued to wage continual war against the Turks for the deliverance and union of the Serbian people. It was with this end in view that they fought in 1912-1913 against the Turks and Bulgarians, and, in this horrible world war, against the Germans and Austrians. The object of the Montenegrin dynasty was quite different. It has always kept its personal interest in sight, and has always sacrificed the most vital interests of the state to its own personal advantage. The best proof of this assertion is Montenegro's shameful capitulation in 1915, which was effected without the complicity or even the slightest knowledge of the Montenegrins.

But, when the glorious Serbian and Allied armies once more brought liberty to Montenegro, the Montenegrins, in the Great National Skupshtina, on November 13, 1918, deposed the reigning sovereign and voted for union with their Serbian brethren and, consequently, with their Croatian and Slovene brothers, also.

The union with Serbia has been effected by the Montenegrins in the following fashion: A National Central Committee with four members has been established. The Committee has drawn up rules governing elections, which is contrary to the wishes and desires of the ex-King of Montenegro and his camarilla, but quite in consonance with the wishes of the Montenegrins.

Before the Balkan war (1912-1913), the National Skupshtina was composed of seventy-six members, of which the fifty-six sub-prefectures elected one each; the towns, six; and the King,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fourteen. According to the regulations which have governed the elections to the Great National Skupshtina, each sub-perfecture elected two members, (112); the fourteen new districts, three each (forty-two); and the towns elected fourteen, making a total of 168 members. The new districts, acquired in 1912-1913, which, under a special ordinance, did not take part in the elections of 1914 under the régime of King Nicholas, participated in the last election on the same terms as the domain of old Montenegro. Throughout the country the elections were perfectly orderly, and sent to the Skupshtina the best representatives of the country. Out of the 168 members, there were seventy-six university graduates.

The Great National Skupshtina met on November 11 (24), and on November 13 (26) unanimously proclaimed the fall of the King and of his dynasty, and the union of Montenegro with Serbia under the Karageorgévitch dynasty. There was not a voice raised for the ex-King, although there were in the Skupshtina a considerable number of his former partisans.

The Great National Skupshtina thus voted in complete freedom, nor was it swayed by any pressure either from the Serbs or the Serbian army, or from any outside influence whatever. Indeed the Serbian army, excepting a company of Jugoslavs at Podgoriza, one at Cettinjé, and one at Bar, was not in Montenegro at the time.

The people greeted with the utmost enthusiasm the decision of the Great National Skupshtina and solemnly celebrated the union and liberty for which they had struggled so fiercely.

Therefore, the supporters of the ex-King of Montenegro are guilty of calumny when they say that the union with Serbia and the Serbian people has been forcibly imposed upon the Montenegrins. *It is also an insult to the Montenegrins, for* such a view denies them their most sacred rights, since it insinuates that today they no longer desire the things for which they have for centuries heroically striven.

On the contrary, the Montenegrins desire and demand their unconditional union with Serbia. Indeed, the union is also dictated by their political and economic interests. The whole Montenegrin people demand it.

The King's camarilla, whose head is the well-known criminal, the guiding spirit in many bloody affairs in Montenegro, Yovan Plamenatz, this time planned another bloody affair at Cettinjé on the 6th of last January. With the assistance of agents and money, supplied by the enemies of Montenegrin liberty, the camarilla collected some of the ex-King's satellites, and attacked Cettinjé unexpectedly. Their object was to take possession of the Government. The city, being without means of defence, was entered and these traitors succeeded in killing eleven young people—most of them schoolboys. But the townsfolk speedily came on the scene, dispersed the criminals, and drove them to take refuge with the Italians, who carried them off into Italy, where they spread false and interested rumors on the Montenegrin situation. The principal criminal, who has rendered good service to the Austrians and Germans during the war, escaped to Rome, and finally reached Paris, where he devised the new Government of the ex-King of Montenegro. These rebels and malefactors still pose as representatives of the Montenegrins. Now they are calling upon the Allies to lead them, and to "save" the Montenegrins from Serbia—Serbia, which had brought them liberty, while the plotters, when they capitulated, like the traitors that they were, had no thought either of the Montenegrins or of our allies.

In Montenegro today all is quite quiet, and no one ever hears of rebellion, still less of opposing the union with Serbia, Croatia, *and Slovenia.* The [Montenegrin] people has won its national liberty; it has decided without outside interference its future destiny; it has attained the realization of its national aspirations. It now has the right to demand of its allies protection from the intrigues of the ex-King of Montenegro and of his camarilla. This is the truth about the present situation in Montenegro.

Martial Law in India

AN interesting illustration of the system of martial law in practice in India was published as a military order from Lahore in the *Englishman* (Calcutta) of May 7.

Whereas it has been proved to me that certain students in Lahore Colleges are in the habit of defacing with obscene and filthy comments, pictures appearing in illustrated papers of members of His Majesty's Naval and Military Forces, Civil or other Services,

And whereas such obscene and filthy comments are calculated to promote disaffection and bad feeling, and to be prejudicial to good order,

Now, therefore, I warn all concerned that it shall be deemed to be a contravention of Martial Law, for any person to deface or mark any picture or letterpress purporting to represent or refer to British subjects, by signs, drawings, or words calculated to bring contempt, ridicule, or dislike on such British subjects,

And such prohibition is also extended to the use of words, signs, or gestures directed at, addressed or referring to any such British subjects,

And I shall hold responsible for such outrages on illustrations all who are inmates, owners, and (or) occupiers, students and teachers, of the premises in which such damaged or defaced picture or literature is discovered.

FRANK JOHNSON,
Lieutenant-Colonel,
Commanding, Lahore (Civil) Area.

Lahore, May 1.

Philippine Independence

THE following resolutions, adopted at a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines, were presented on June 2 by the Philippine Commission of Independence to the Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Congress. On June 5 it was reported that the Nationalist party of the Philippines won a "sweeping victory" in the recent elections.

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Philippines, in joint session assembled in the Marble Hall of the Ayuntamiento, that the following Declaration of Purposes be, and the same hereby is, adopted, to wit:

The Philippine question has reached such a stage that a full and final exchange of views between the United States of America and the Philippine Islands has become necessary. We need not repeat the declarations respecting the national aspirations of the Filipino people. Such declarations have been made from time to time in the most frank and solemn manner by the constitutional representatives of the Philippine nation and are a matter of permanent record in public documents covering more than a decade of persistent efforts particularly during the last three years. America, on her part, has been sufficiently explicit in her purposes from the beginning of her occupation of the Philippines. It is true that the Treaty of Paris, whereby the sovereignty formerly exercised by Spain passed to the United States, was negotiated and concluded without the intervention or consent of the Filipinos, and that the United States of America did not occupy the Philippine Archipelago upon a previous categorical declaration like that formulated and made public before the occupation of Cuba. But, aside from certain differences in the details of both occupations which, not having been foreseen upon the declaration of war between the United States and Spain, subsequently gave rise to debate and differences of opinion regarding procedure, it is an incontrovertible fact that the definite purpose of the United States in both cases was the same: the disinterested liberation of the peoples subjugated by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spain. The American flag that waved over Cuba for lofty reasons of humanity and justice scrupulously observed and respected after the victory is the same flag which, when the war spread to this part of the globe, extended its protecting folds over another people anxious for justice and liberty. And that American flag could not stand for emancipation in Cuba and, at the same time, for forcible subjugation in the Philippines. The difference, if such ever existed, consisted only in matters of detail, not in the affirmation and observance of the cardinal principles. In one case, owing to the proximity of Cuba to the American shores, the terms of the problem were known at the outset and provisions had been made for its solution. In the other, the lack of adequate information in the United States as to the true conditions of the Philippine problem, aggravated by long distance, momentarily obscured the question and naturally gave rise to a less determined and speedy procedure. Thus, while Cuba became free and independent after scarcely four years of American occupation, the Philippines, which professed the same ideals as their sister of the Antilles, continue in a state of dependency after more than twenty years of such occupation.

In submitting the Philippine question to the Government and people of the United States, the Commission of Independence will find it necessary to refer to the natural acerbity of the situation, or to the anxiety of our people which two decades of occupation have only served to accentuate. The steadfastness of our position is not due to mere sentiment, but to the justice of our cause, sanctified by the laws of God and nature not only, but admitted in the promises solemnly made by the United States and accepted by the Philippines. Although attention should respectfully be invited to the fact that the Filipino people have never renounced their independence, not even in the moments of the greatest adversity brought about by the enforced or voluntary submission of their own leaders, yet the Commission of Independence in dwelling upon the promises made will unreservedly and with the deepest gratitude recognize that they were made freely and generously to a small and powerless people after they had suffered defeat in the field of battle. The deliberate attitude of our country in reposing confidence in those promises and laboring peacefully in pursuance thereof, must also be asserted. Thus, after the rupture of relations occasioned by three years of war during which the right of the Filipinos to their independence was disputed—unsuccessfully so far as they were concerned—violence gave way to harmony, and hostility to coöperation; and thanks to the growing influence of the new conditions of peace, Americans and Filipinos, who a short time ago fought each other and stained the Philippine soil with blood, undertook jointly together, on the basis of a friendly undertaking, a magnificent labor which has been carried on with the orderly progress of liberty and self-government.

The Commission must not lose sight of the fact that the altruistic ideals and the wise and efficient aid of America in peace, justly won for her our confidence and gratitude. Far from allowing a policy of selfish exploitation to direct the destinies of these Islands, America proclaimed and insisted that the interest and welfare of the Philippines were to be considered a sacred trust confided to the people of the United States. Instead of the national spirit being stifled, it was announced from the outset that the natural development of self-government would be promoted. The total surrender of the government of the municipalities to popular control, the constant increase in the measure of self-government in the administration of the provinces, and the growing participation of the people in the management of the central Government and of national affairs; the plan of a general free elementary education conceived from the start; the establishment of the National Assembly, with the subsequent addition of an elective Senate; and, finally, the acceptance of the offers of adhesion and aid of the Philippines to the cause of America in the recent war, based on the principles of justice and self-government, liberty, and security for small nations, as proclaimed by the Government of the United States, are fundamental facts of the policy of America in these Islands which have appealed to the heart and brightened the hopes of the Filipino people. President Roosevelt, proudly contemplating, rather than the initial results of the work, the loftiness and purity of the principles enunciated, said with good reason that "no great civilized Power has ever handled with such wisdom and disinterestedness the affairs of a people committed by the accident of war to its hands." "Save only our attitude towards Cuba," Mr. Roosevelt continued, "I question whether there is a brighter page in the annals of international dealing between the strong and the weak than the page which tells of our doings in the Philippines" (January 27, 1908), and subsequently he proclaimed, in a message to Congress, that "the Filipino people, through their officials, are therefore making real steps in the direction of self-government" and that he hoped and trusted that these steps would mark "the beginning of a course which will continue till the Filipinos become fit to decide for themselves whether they desire to be an independent nation" (December 8, 1908). In the opinion of William H. Taft, who implanted our civil régime, the national policy with regard to the Philippines contemplated a gradual and constant extension of popular control, and, making a logical deduction, he said, "When the Filipino people, as a whole, show themselves reasonably fit to conduct a popular self-government, maintaining law and order and offering equal protection of the laws and civil rights to rich and poor, and desire complete independence of the United States, they shall be given it" (January 23, 1908). These statements of Mr. Taft, made while he was Secretary of War, were confirmed by him when, as President of the United States, he said in a message to Congress: "We should endeavor to secure for the Filipinos economic independence and to fit them for complete self-government, with the power to decide eventually, according to their own largest good, whether such self-government shall be accompanied by independence."

On March 4, 1913, there was a change in the administration of the United States and the power passed from the Republicans to the Democrats. Seven months later, Francis Burton Harrison, the new Governor-General, communicated to the Filipino people the following message from President Wilson: "We regard ourselves as trustees acting not for the advantage of the United States, but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the Islands and as a preparation for that independence. And we hope to move toward that end as rapidly as the safety and the permanent interests of the Islands will permit. After each step taken, experience will guide us to the next" (October 6, 1913). On the occasion of the change in the Philippine Commission, which acted as the upper house of the legislature, the Filipinos were given an effective majority in both houses, and in accordance with the new policy that in the administration of affairs in the Philippines America desired not her own counsel, but the counsel of the Filipinos, the Filipinization of the service was accelerated and other administrative measures were adopted to extend the popular control in the government. Finally, maintaining all the progress made and emphasizing the steps toward independence, frankly announced by President Wilson, the Congress of the United States approved the new organic law for the Philippines of August 29, 1916, which formally promises the Filipinos their independence and grants them a more autonomous government. Thus the burden of the international responsibilities assumed by the United States by virtue of the Treaty of Paris passed in effect to the hands of the Filipino people, and a pact was virtually consummated between America and the Philippines, analogous to that established between America and Cuba by the passage of the Teller Resolution which led to the war between America and Spain and publicly defined America's purpose at that time.

During this period of confident waiting, when our attitude was one of mere coöperation, as well as when we assumed the new powers conferred by the Jones Law, the Commission of Independence will find, throughout the entire record of over

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twenty years, positive facts demonstrating our full capacity for national independence and self-government. In the plan of a general free education and of sanitary improvements; in the vast public works programme with respect to roads and bridges, public buildings, and irrigation systems; in the fostering of agriculture, industry, and commerce, including the provision of banking facilities, port improvements, and an adequate system of transportation by land and sea; in the establishment of an efficient civil service and an independent judiciary; in the constant development of self-government in the local organizations and the central Government, and in the adoption of measures for the free and orderly exercise of the popular suffrage; in the exercise, in fine, of all the political powers entrusted to us, no effort has been spared to promote the public good. Any unprejudiced critic will find after an impartial examination that we have successfully created a condition which demonstrates that the Filipino people, in managing their own affairs, can maintain law and order, and afford equal protection to all, whether foreigners or nationals.

Despite the party struggles that precede the elections, particularly those that attended the first general election held on the occasion of the inauguration of the Philippine Assembly, the work of that body and that of the present purely elective legislature which succeeded it show that there exists in these Islands a strong and complete national unity which places general interests above petty local partisanships. In our budget system, successfully implanted since both Houses became elective, no costly extravagances, local selfishness, or "log-rolling" and "pork barrel" practices find any place. Our financial system and the appearance of Cabinet members before the Houses of the Legislature have effected a coördination of forces and leadership which has promoted the efficiency of the Administration and assured its responsibility to the people. The stability of the present Government, managed almost entirely by Filipinos, has been put to a test not only by the extension of its authority to all the remote districts of the Islands inhabited by Mohammedans and other non-Christian Filipinos, where, as in the rest of the country, there now reigns perfect order maintained by civil officers, but also by the uninterrupted maintenance of a complete state of peace, order, and security during the recent war which devastated the fields of Europe and sowed the seed of restlessness and discontent throughout the world.

As an evidence of the appreciation of the high purposes and disinterested work of the Americans who have aided the Filipinos, all useful public institutions in existence at the inauguration of the Philippine Assembly in 1907 have been preserved and perfected. Notwithstanding the policy of Filipinization implanted by President McKinley, no American employee in sympathy with this country and with the common work carried on has been retired from the service against his will and without an equitable compensation. It must be a source of legitimate pride and satisfaction to every American to know that the noble and humanitarian purposes expressed by President McKinley and his successors in their instructions, messages, and other official documents as the reason for American occupation has been successfully attained by the united and harmonious effort of Americans and Filipinos.

Now, in applying the principles enunciated in documents and utterances on the Philippines to the conditions now existing in the Islands, the Independence Mission will find the following facts:

That there exist at present in the Philippine Islands the conditions of order and government which America has for nearly a century and a half required in all cases in which she has recognized the independence of a country or the establishment of a new Government, not even excepting the case of the Government of General Huerta in Mexico, which she refused to recognize because it was stained with blood and established through intrigue, deceit, and crime;

That there exist likewise in the Philippines all the conditions of stability and guarantees for law and order that Cuba had to establish to the satisfaction of America in order to obtain her independence, or to preserve it, during the military occupation of 1898-1902 and during the intervention of 1906-1909, respectively;

That the "preparation for independence" and the "stable Government" required by President Wilson and the Congress of the United States, respectively, contain no new requisite not included in any of the cases above cited;

That these prerequisites for Philippine independence are the same as those virtually or expressly established by the Republican Administrations that preceded President Wilson's Administration;

That during the entire time that the Filipino people have been with America, they have been living in the confidence that the American occupation was only temporary and that its final aim was not aggrandizement or conquest, but the peace, welfare, and liberty of the Filipino people;

That this faith in the promises of America was a cardinal factor not only in the coöperation between Americans and Filipinos during the years of peace, but also in the coöperation between Americans and Filipinos during the late war;

That the condition of thorough development of the internal affairs of the country and the present international atmosphere of justice, liberty, and security for all peoples are the most propitious for the fulfillment by America of her promises and for her redemption of the pledges she has made before the world.

In the light of these facts and considerations, the Filipino people are confident that it will be possible to arrive at a satisfactory final decision, as we deal no longer with a disputed question, but are merely endeavoring to agree upon the final adjustment of a matter with regard to which, according to President Wilson's words, there exists, so far as fundamentals are concerned, "a perfect harmony of ideals and feelings" between the Governments of the United States and of the Philippine Islands, which harmony has brought about "that real friendship and mutual support which is the foundation of all sound political policy" (November 29, 1918).

Therefore, so far as it is humanly possible to judge and say, we can see only one aim for the Commission of Independence—independence; and we can give only one instruction—to get it. Thus America, in adding another glory to her banner by establishing the first really democratic republic in the East, will apply a second time, generously and freely, the same measure of humanity and justice that she applied in the case of Cuba, which is but a logical and natural sequence of the immortal principles of the Declaration of Independence. This Declaration, which belongs to all humanity, has now as much force as it had in the days when America proclaimed it. America will thus vindicate the memory of President McKinley, to whom the "forcible annexation" of peoples meant "criminal aggression" and who, upon taking over the Philippines "for high duty in the interest of their inhabitants and for humanity and civilization," solemnly said: "Our sacrifices were with this high motive. We want to improve the condition of the inhabitants, securing them peace, liberty, and the pursuit of their highest good."

Thus, finally, America will carry out the efforts and assurances of President Wilson when, upon the signing of the armistice, he said to the Filipinos: "I hope and believe that the future holds brighter hope for the states which have heretofore been the prey of Great Powers and will realize for all the world the offers of justice and peace which have prompted the magnificent coöperation of the present war" (November 29, 1918).

The Filipinos will thus have a better opportunity to demonstrate how deeply rooted is their gratitude for America when, after her voluntary withdrawal from these Islands, we preserve here the immortal spirit of her democratic institutions and associate with her in her future enterprises of justice and peace in carrying to the darkest corners of the earth, which lack happiness because their people do not control their own destinies, the quickening flame of justice, democracy, and liberty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Press

Socialization of the Press in Munich

THE transformation of the capitalist press into an instrument for proletarian education and propaganda engaged the attention of the successive Governments at Munich up to May 1, when Hoffman's Government troops entered the city. The Council's Republic, proclaimed on April 7, as one of its first acts promulgated regulations for the socialization of the press, the following account of which appeared in the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten* of April 10.

In order to begin the socialization of the press immediately, the entire press of Bavaria is put under social control. The entire operation and management are, in their economic aspect also, under public supervision. Administrative councils shall exercise control and these shall lead the authorities to their decisions. In order to make the influence of the Socialist régime effective and at the same time make a really free expression of opinion possible, special provisions will be made immediately.

The Revolutionary Central Council,
(Signed) TOLLER.

At the session of press representatives which met on Tuesday at the Ministry of Trade and Commerce, Comrade Marut read a plan for the socialization of the press, whose most important points are here explained.

All papers circulate in the city where they appear by authority of this decree. The city reserves no right of tutelage over the newspapers. The city has no right to exercise disciplinary powers over any newspaper employee. But the city insures every newspaper employee his stipulated income. To conduct the business, an administrative council is organized consisting of one member of the Government, two members of the Workers' Council, one member of each party that possesses a newspaper, one member of the union of Socialist teachers, and one unattached Socialist writer; the publishers of each paper are advisory members of the council. The enlarged administrative council consists of the small council—as organized above—and one hand compositor, one linotype operator, one pressman, one helper, one commercial employee, and one editor of each paper.

The editorial staff decides the content of the paper. In case of dispute the member of the party to which the paper is allotted decides.

The contracts of all employees remain in force. Editors who, after socialization, believe they cannot conscientiously continue to work may resign. They receive their pay in monthly installments for six months more. At the expiration of that time they receive the usual unemployment pay. The city is bound to bear these gentlemen in mind in the disposal of suitable positions. The administrative council is primarily responsible for all contracts; ultimately, the city.

Socialization makes expropriation necessary. The previous owners receive no compensation. In case the previous owners are needy on account of expropriation, they may be employed in their previous positions. They may be paid for their services, and, indeed, deserve pay. The salary for one person is in no case to be more than 12,000 M. per year. Those proprietors who previously had a definite activity in their enterprise are bound to carry on their activity for at least six months after socialization. If no substitute is found after that time, they must continue to act, according to the judgment of the council.

Sabotage or resistance of proprietors or employees will be regarded as counter-revolutionary activity and will be treated as such. The persons concerned will be liable for any damage in double the amount of the damage. Those who are incapacitated as a result of old age or illness, receive a pension.

All money for subscriptions and advertisements is to be turned over to the administrative council. From this sum the administrative council has to pay all the necessary expenses of the paper. Parties or individuals must no longer be enriched by the press.

Those political parties which do not publish a paper of their own at any place have the right to demand two or three columns from the existing papers every day for their purposes. For this they need not pay. The party which desires this privilege must be actually represented in the place by a local group. All statements will be signed by the party. The papers are compelled to publish at the usual rate any advertisement from parties which do not have a local organ.

The right of freedom of opinion shall not be taken from anyone. The bourgeosie and the capitalists have the means of publishing their own papers, if they deem it necessary. But they may not longer make a business of advertising. The proletariat for decades has wearily had to raise the means to create a press. It has accomplished this great task by pure idealism and by unshakable confidence in its mission. If the bourgeoisie really has anything worth while to say and believes that its coöperation in the reconstruction of our broken-down civilization is necessary, then it is certainly in a position to express its opinion without wishing to make a business of advertising, as used to be the case.

The administrative council of the place where the paper or periodical is published, will from today on manage the whole advertising business. All income from advertisements which appear in dailies or periodicals must be turned over to the administrative council. Periodicals remain, for the time, in the possession of the previous publisher; they can be expropriated, if the administrative council deems it wise. The periodical publisher may receive for advertisements only the amount which the printing and the paper for the advertisements cost. Periodicals which cannot exist without the income from advertisements have no reason for existence; let them die.

In order to carry on the advertising business, the advertising offices will be taken over by the administrative councils. The transfer takes place as in Article 7. The managers are required here also to remain in their positions and carry out the orders of the administrative councils. All surpluses which the administrative councils obtain, are to be devoted to those papers and periodicals whose financial condition is bad, but which it is necessary to keep up. But only for papers that are indispensable. For it would be no loss if a large proportion of dailies were to die off.

All further surplus will be used for cultural purposes. Half of the surplus is to be used for the cheap distribution of good books and enlightening literature, the other half is to be used for working people's theatres, concerts, and scientific and cultural lectures; also for entertainments, games, and people's festivals. The surplus from papers and advertisements is not to be devoted to any other purpose.

Necessary papers and periodicals must be supported like schools. But the people are to determine what is necessary.

The papers are to order all writers and scholars to send in political, scientific, and technical articles, as well as works on art and literature. These works must be properly paid for by the paper that accepts them. Articles for which payment is not asked, should not be accepted. But articles should not be paid for if written by editors on the staff. Any one who publishes or seeks to publish an article for which he has been paid or bribed by any person, party, or group of interests will be regarded as a counter-revolutionist.

After the successful socialization of the press, the socialization of the whole printing and publishing business will be taken up. The following must be socialized next: correspondence and news bureaus, paper factories, type-foundries, theatres, moving-picture houses.

The employees concerned are urged in their meetings and conversations to discuss this plan of socialization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Bourgeois Specialists" and the Soviet Government

THE establishment of friendly relations between the Bolsheviki and the Menshevist and Social Revolutionary parties, following the overthrow of the Omsk Government by Admiral Kolchak, has resulted in the reappearance at Moscow, by permission of the Soviet Government, of *Dyelo Naroda,* the organ of the Social Revolutionaries. A sharp criticism of the Soviet Government, in the issue of March 23 of *Dyelo Naroda,* was reprinted in the *Review of the Foreign Press* (British War Office) of May 2.

At a meeting of the Communist party N. Lenin said: "If yesterday we spoke of legalizing the small bourgeois parties and today we arrest the Mensheviki and Left Social Revolutionaries, we are following in these fluctuations a perfectly definite system. A very strong line runs all through these fluctuations, namely, to excise counter revolution and make use of the cultural bourgeois apparatus."

This system is not new. It was proclaimed more than a year ago and is being unswervingly carried out. It consists in cutting off as counter revolutionaries all persons of firm convictions and definite social and political views, for there is no other than the Bolshevist revolution, and Lenin is its prophet. At the same time, all bourgeois specialists are to be drawn into the Bolshevist service by the attraction of high salaries or by the fear of consequences. The knowledge and ability of non-party bourgeois may serve capitalism and communism equally well. It is only necessary to grant such bourgeois exceptionally good conditions. And a year ago Lenin promised not to stint means for that purpose.

What is to be done? Lenin and the party of Communists whom he represents know what to do. How to do it will be shown by the bourgeois specialists. Nothing more is required for the success of the cause. We had an example of such collaboration a year ago. A commission of Communists and bourgeois specialists met under the presidency of Spunide, and the specialists explained nationalization to the Communists and how it should be carried out. But we do not see that the Communists have learned anything during these twelve months, or that nationalization, with the coöperation of specialists, is going any better now than before. And more than this, the Communists seem to have begun to realize that they will not go far with collaborators who are induced to work with them by the enticement of money or by the compulsion of fear. They see that among these collaborators, and especially among the October Communists, there are not a few corrupt persons, without shame or honor, ready at any moment to betray the Soviet authorities, and secretly rejoicing at their failures; that among them are many real counter-revolutionaries and members of the Black Hundreds. And it must be clear even to the most unthinking Communist that all attempts to obtain zeal, honesty, and devotion from that kind of colleague by means of persecution, surveillance, and harsh penalties are doomed to failure from the very beginning.

It would seem that this alphabet of the matter has been understood by the Communists. Apparently this effort to organize socialist economy with the help of bourgeois specialists is also recognized by them as an attempt with bad and inappropriate means. From Lenin himself we have heard that an agreement with the small bourgeois parties—which is to say, all the other Socialist parties besides the Communists—is possible, and therefore it ought to be reached. Is this so or not? Or do you finally intend to return again to your "system"?

If you stand for widening the foundation on which the Soviet authority is now based, then draw the logical conclusion. Such an enlargement of base is possible only by means of compromise, and the first step towards it would be by renunciation of party dictatorship and terror, and at least the honorable introduction of the Constitution which you have drawn up.

If you really wish for an agreement or a reconciliation with the social elements represented by the Mensheviki and Social Revolutionaries, elements which you call small bourgeois parties, and which, in fact, consist of a considerable part of the town proletariat and laboring peasantry, you must allow complete freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly. For only in that way, in a free press and in free workmen's and peasants' meetings can the compromise which you seek and the policy which you should adopt be discussed in order to bring about the unification of the working social democracy.

The Manchester Liberals

THE following summary of the programme of the Manchester Liberal Federation, as formulated by a conference held at Manchester, England, during the last week in May, appeared in the *Times* (London) of May 26.

THE PEACE. A League of all nations, belligerent and neutral. Restoration of personal, commercial, and political liberty. This is to be one of the first tasks of the Liberal party. The Defence of the Realm Act to be entirely repealed and the various Orders in Council cancelled.

CONSCRIPTION. Firm opposition to any form of compulsory military service as a permanent institution in our national life.

TAXATION AND FINANCE. Annual expenditure and all interest and sinking fund charges to be met out of revenue. Taxation as far as possible to be direct. Duties on tea, sugar, and all foodstuffs to be abolished as well as the corn subsidy. A separate assessment of income-tax for husbands and wives, the limit of exemption to be raised to £160 and the amount of rebate allowed for a wife and each child to be materially increased.

SECOND CHAMBER. A purely elective Second Chamber, having no power to veto.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. To be elected by proportional representation for a term not exceeding five years, an earlier dissolution being dependent upon a special resolution after notice carried by a majority of the whole membership of the House.

IRELAND. The Home Rule Act to be put into force immediately.

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POLICY. This section provides for a scheme of Imperial federation embracing all the Colonies and Dependencies, the guiding principle being the consultation for common purposes of free and autonomous institutions acting through representative institutions.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Local authorities to have greatly extended powers of initiation, and departmental power of veto to be reduced.

PUBLIC HEALTH. A Ministry of Health; 500,000 new houses; a state medical research service; a comprehensive scheme for infant welfare, the health of school children, and the treatment of tuberculosis.

EDUCATION. A large programme of reform mainly on the lines of the original Fisher Bill.

PENSIONS. The Ministry of Pensions to administer old-age pensions; the amount of pensions to be raised, the qualifying age to be sixty-five, the income-tax bar to be abolished, pensions for widows and women who have children dependent on them.

Other points in the programme include: national trade councils in organized industries and trade boards in unorganized industries; equal pay to women for equal work; removal of sex barriers to the professions and the civil service; an equal moral standard for men and women in divorce; state control of monopolies; disestablishment; greater state control of the drink traffic; adult suffrage; and a provision that no new hereditary titles shall be created and that existing hereditary titles, with the exception of those of the Royal Family, shall cease with the death of the present holders.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

PENDING the passage of the new "Aliens Restrictions Bill," now before the House of Commons, the British Government proposes to proceed in accordance with an Order-in-Council which has been drawn up in connection with the Bill, and which provides that immigration officers shall permit no alien to land who is not in a position to support himself and his dependents, who is in any way mentally deficient, who has been certified as undesirable for medical reasons, who has been sentenced in a foreign country for any extradition crime, or is the subject of a deportation order. Aliens will be permitted to land only at certain specified ports, and all aliens are to be registered. On the recommendation of the Admiralty or the Army Council any area may be declared a protected area from which aliens may be excluded altogether or permitted to remain under restrictions. The police are given the power to close clubs and restaurants frequented by aliens, if such a step seems advisable. Any former alien enemy who at the date of the termination of the war was interned in the United Kingdom, is to be regarded as remaining in legal custody for six months after that date, and shall not be released without an order of the Secretary of State. During this period the Secretary of State may direct the removal of any or all former enemy aliens and may prescribe the manner of their removal and their destination.

THE adoption by the Swiss Confederation of a new system of direct taxation is the subject of an article in a late issue of the *Journal des Débats*. The new tax, which is expected to yield 400,000,000 francs a year, is to be levied during a period of sixteen years on fortunes exceeding 10,000 francs, and on all products of labor exceeding 5,000 francs in value, with reductions for fathers of families. The most important opposition to the tax was based on the assertion that it would array the fiscal sovereignty of the Confederation against that of the Cantons. It was further objected that the tax was undemocratic, since it would fall on a comparatively small portion of the population. The affirmative vote is attributed to the anti-Socialist sentiment of the rural population. The Socialists, who were at first in favor of the tax, later declared against it, the reason for this change, according to the article mentioned above, being a desire to destroy the finances of the state. This stand so enraged the anti-Socialist elements that they rallied to the support of the tax, which was carried in all the Cantons except Geneva and Neuchâtel.

ACCORDING to a dispatch in the *Vossische Zeitung* of May 5, the Social Democrats dominated the May elections in Lower Austria. Of the 500,000 men and 620,000 women entitled to vote, about 60 per cent. went to the polls. The Christian Socialist forces, who have been in control at Vienna for the past twenty years, were defeated by the Social Democrats. Among the deputies elected—in addition to Renner, Seitz, Adler, and the other Socialists—were three Jewish nationalists and nine Czech nationalists. The result of the election has led the Christian Socialists to demand that Vienna become the capital of a federal state, so that they may retain control in the old crown-lands.

THE final results of the late elections in Finland show the following distribution of parties in the Diet: eighty Socialists, forty-two Agrarians, twenty-eight members of the Finnish Coalition party, twenty-six of the Finnish Progressive party, twenty-two of the Swedish People's party, and two of the Christian Labor party. The election of the new Diet resulted in the resignation of the Ingmann Ministry. Professor Soininen was first asked to form a new Government, but was unsuccessful. Kaarlo Castrén, Finance Minister, succeeded in forming a Government which has the support of ninety members of the Diet comprising three groups, the Agrarians, the Progressives, and the Swedish party. The Agrarians are small peasants of radical tendencies and lean toward socialism. The Socialists are demanding complete amnesty for all prisoners held for complicity in the rebellion, and a reduction of the military forces and of the White Guard. In view of present disturbed conditions, their demands are not likely to be conceded by the bourgeois parties.

SINCE the beginning of the present year unemployment in Denmark has increased at such a rapid rate that it has come to overshadow all other problems. From a pre-war maximum of 50,000, the number of unemployed has increased until it now totals more than 63,000. The Government has been trying to meet the situation by the passage of laws for subsidizing labor union benefit funds, for establishing government employment bureaus, and for lending money to communities in order to enable them to carry on public works. The Ministry of the Interior has called conferences between representatives of the trades unions and the employers' associations in the hope of reaching a solution of the problem.

PRESIDENT MASARYK of the Czecho-Slovak Republic recently declared, in an interview with a correspondent of the Frankfort *Gazette*, that the geographical position of his country made it necessary to establish close relations with the German state, and that his Government would make every effort to maintain harmony between the two peoples. With regard to German Bohemia, he affirmed that no attempt would be made to denationalize the German Bohemians, who would enjoy full rights of citizenship in the Czecho-Slovak state; on the other hand, they could not legitimately invoke the right of self-determination as affirmed by President Wilson, since this right could be invoked in Europe only when based on the principle of nationality, and there was in German Bohemia an important Czech minority. The Czecho-Slovaks also desired to maintain friendly relations with German Austria, but could do so only if the Government at Vienna acted in better faith toward them than it had previously done. The question now, President Masaryk affirmed, was less one of nationalism than of internationalism, as the development of the League of Nations would undoubtedly bring into being the United States of Europe.

PEONAGE in Ecuador has recently been abolished by legislative decree. Prior to the passage of the decree, a peon was compelled to remain on an estate as long as he was indebted to the owner, a condition amounting virtually to slavery, since the owner could easily manage to keep the peon in a state of permanent indebtedness. The decree completed the emancipation of the peons by cancelling all their debts. A peon may now go where he pleases, work for whom he will, and enjoy equal rights with other citizens of the republic.

TWO recent French publications on the war are Victor Giraud's *Histoire de la Grande Guerre* (First Part) and Maurice Barrès's *De la Sympathie à la Fraternité d'Armes*. The first deals with the origins of the war, its outbreak, the French retreat to the Marne, and the battle of the Marne. The second, of particular interest to Americans, is a French view of American participation in the war. M. Barrès professes a great admiration for the United States and its military aid, and expresses the hope and belief that American coöperation with France will outlive the war which brought it about.

Contributors to this Issue

SURENDRA KARR is a Hindu lecturer and journalist at present resident in the United States.

GILBERT REID was for many years at the head of the International Institute at Shanghai.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"History," says Clarenaon, "is a lively Representation of Persons and Actions, which makes the Reader present at all they say and do."

Readers who like occasionally to drop out of the current rush for a quiet hour with men of letters and statesmen of an earlier day will relish these pictures of the 17th century. The celebrated figures stand out boldly; distinct in their genius and alive with the brilliance of their wit.

Selections from James Boswell's Life of Samuel Johnson

Chosen and Edited by R. W. CHAPMAN

$1.60

Mr. Chapman has selected the choicest portions, drawing also on his letters and anecdotes of his acquaintances so that the whole gives a true picture of Johnson's character and of the Johnsonian circle.

Characters from the Histories and Memoirs of the 17th Century

By DAVID NICOLL SMITH

$2.70

"About ninety portraits in all, done by many hands on many scales, from Aubrey's jottings to Clarendon's fullest length. A book to read and reread and travel with."—*New Republic.*

New Volumes on the War

Britannia Victrix

By ROBERT BRIDGES
Poet Laureate

Net 25c.

The Poet Laureate's commemoration poem on England's emerging victorious from the great War.

"Land, dear land, whose sea-built shore
Nurseth warriors evermore."

Ostend and Zeebrugge

April 23: May 10, 1918.

Edited by C. SANFORD TERRY

Net $3.25

A complete account of one of the most brilliant exploits of the War. Official Dispatches, Press Accounts, that of the German Admiralty and several personal narratives.

The Reconstruction of Russia

Edited by SIR PAUL VINOGRADOFF

Net 75c.

Three essays by leading authorities which though in pamphlet form are of considerable value. The London Times refers to them as "this very valuable and timely little volume."

India as seen by her historian—two volumes just issued

By Vincent A. Smith

The Oxford History of India

From the Earliest Times to 1911

Net $6.25

Easily the best work on the subject in the language. This volume is everything that a short history intended to be both comprehensive and compact should be. It is based on original research, sound scholarship and compresses within a single volume information which might easily have been extended to six or eight.

Indian Constitutional Reform

Viewed in the Light of History

$1.60

A consideration, by a historian of India, of the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms. It includes a statement of the historical Indian ideal of government, a study of cast and other Indian problems, and a number of constructive suggestions.

Take this ad to your bookseller. Give him your name and we will send you, free of charge, our illustrated magazine, **"The Periodical."** *If no bookseller is convenient, make request directly to us.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 West 32nd Street
New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED